

Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

84TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 4647

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MARCH 7, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

A BILL

To amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That section 353 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of
4 1938, as amended, is amended by adding a new paragraph
5 (3) to subsection (c) thereof, reading as follows:

6 “(3) Each of the State acreage allotments for 1955
7 heretofore proclaimed by the Secretary shall be increased by
8 five per centum. In any State having county acreage allot-
9 ments for 1955 the increase in the State allotment shall be
10 apportioned among counties in the State on the same basis
11 as the State allotment was heretofore apportioned among

1 the counties, but without regard to adjustments for trends
2 in acreage. The increases in the county acreage allotments
3 and the increases in the State allotments, where county al-
4 lotments are not determined, shall be used to establish farm
5 acreage allotments which are fair and reasonable in relation
6 to the applicable allotment factors specified in subsection (b)
7 of this section and to correct inequities and prevent hard-
8 ships.”

A BILL

To amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas

MARCH 7, 1955

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued
For actions of

March 21, 1955
March 18, 1955
84th-1st, No. 49

CONTENTS

A.C.P.....7	Livestock.....7	School lunch.....18
Acreage allotments..2,8,34	Loans, farm.....31	Selective service.....22
Adjournment.....17	Minerals.....32	Soil conservation.....1,7
Appropriations.....1,6,14	Monopolies.....6,12	Surplus food.....18
Banking and currency....29	Nominations.....10	Statehood.....5
Civil defense.....14	Natural resources.....27	Taxation.....28
Comptroller General....10	Organization, executive..9	Technical assistance.....1
Cotton.....8,19,34	Personnel.....11,30	Tobacco.....3,6
Education.....23	Poultry.....7,26	Trade agreements.....4
Expenditures.....11	Price supports.....6	Transportation.....28
Exports.....19	R.E.A.....24	Veterans' benefits.....31
Forestry.....27,33	Reclamation.....15,25	Virgin Islands.....7
Fruits and vegetables...21	Research.....18	Water compact.....13
Labor, farm.....22	Rice.....2	Wheat.....20
Lands, public.....32	Roads.....5,16	Wind erosion.....1
Legislative program.6,8,17	Rubber.....6	

HIGHLIGHTS: See last page of digest.

HOUSE

1. APPROPRIATIONS. Passed with amendments H. R. 4903, the second supplemental appropriation bill, 1955. Agreed, 174-107, to an amendment by Rep. Preston to provide \$4,000,000 for contributions to the UN expanded program of technical assistance. Rejected, 52-74, an amendment to this amendment, by Rep. Phillips, to reduce this amount to \$2,500,000 and make all of it available to FAO. Also agreed to an amendment by Rep. Taber to provide for the transfer of these funds from the appropriation contained in Public Law 778, 83rd Congress, for assistance authorized by sec. 121 of Public Law 665, 83rd Congress. A similar provision had previously been deleted on a point of order made by Rep. Hoffman, Mich. (pp. 2620-38). Rep. Hill commended the wind-erosion control item (p. 2634).

The Appropriations Committee reported without amendment H. R. 5046, the Labor-HEW appropriation bill, 1956 (H. Rept. 228) (pp. 2619, 2643).

2. RICE. Passed without amendment H. R. 2839, to provide for reapportionment of rice acreage allotments voluntarily surrendered to the county committee; and H. R. 4356, to divide the 1956 and subsequent rice acreage allotments on a farm in accordance with previous acreage allotment (p. 2642).

The Agriculture Committee reported with amendment H. R. 4647, to increase the State rice acreage allotments for 1955 by 5% (H. Rept. 237) (p. 2643).

3. TOBACCO. The Agriculture Committee reported with amendment H. R. 4951, to redetermine the national marketing quota for burley tobacco for the 1955-56 marketing year (H. Rept. 238) (p. 2643).

4. TRADE AGREEMENTS. Rep. Philbin inserted and commended Henry S. Woodbridge's (American Optical Co.) statement urging amendment of H. R. 1, the trade agreements extension bill, so as to preserve skills "essential to our national security" (p. 2638).
5. ROADS; STATEHOOD. Received a resolution and several petitions supporting the position of the American Association of State Highway Officials relating to the proposed Federal-aid highway program and urging Alaska-Hawaii statehood (p. 2644).
6. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM as announced by Majority Leader McCormack: Mon., bill to redetermine burley tobacco allotments and Labor-HEW appropriation bill; Tues. and Wed., resolutions disapproving sale of certain rubber plants and bill to reestablish 90% price supports on basic commodities; and Thurs., Fri., and Sat., Interior appropriation bill and bill to increase penalties under Sherman Antitrust Act (pp. 2628-9).

SENATE

7. VIRGIN ISLANDS; SOIL CONSERVATION. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported without amendment S. 1166, to restore authority on imports of live-stock and poultry into the Virgin Islands (S. Rept. 114); and S. 1167, to permit ACP payments to persons who carry out conservation practices on Federal noncropland which directly benefit nearby or adjoining private lands (S. Rept. 115)(p. 2651).
8. COTTON ALLOTMENTS. Made H. R. 3952, to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 so as to provide for an increase in the 1955 national cotton acreage allotment of approximately 258,000 acres, its unfinished business (p. 2715).
9. REORGANIZATION. Further insisted upon its amendments to H. R. 2576, to continue the Reorganization Act of 1949 (p. 2645). (House conferees have been appointed, but Senate conferees have not.)
10. NOMINATION of Joseph Campbell to be Comptroller General was confirmed (pp. 2669-83, 2791-2).
11. PERSONNEL, EXPENDITURES. Sen. Byrd inserted an additional report from the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures on civilian employment and pay in the executive branch during Jan. 1955 (pp. 2651-5).
Sen. Dirksen (for himself and Sens. Bricker, Butler, Humphrey, Ives, Jackson, Lehman, McNamara, Pastore, Potter, and Kuchel) submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them to S. 67, to increase the pay of Federal employees (p. 2662).
Sen. Humphrey inserted and commended former Sen. Harry Cains's recent address criticizing the Federal employees security program and favoring "a commission of outstanding citizens to concern itself basically with policy questions relating to internal security" (pp. 2683-91).
12. MONOPOLIES. Agreed to S. Res. 61, authorizing expenditure of \$200,000 by the Judiciary Committee for a study of the antitrust laws of the U. S. and their administration, interpretation, and effect, after adoption of a Sen. Ellender amendment to reduce the authorized expenditure from \$250,000 to 200,000 (pp. 2702-3, 2707-8).

EMERGENCY RICE ALLOTMENTS FOR 1955

MARCH 18, 1955.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. COOLEY, from the Committee on Agriculture, submitted the following

R E P O R T

[To accompany H. R. 4647]

The Committee on Agriculture, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4647) to amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill do pass.

The amendments are as follows:

Page 1, lines 4 and 5, strike out the following: "a new paragraph (3)".

Page 1, line 4, strike out the comma after the word "thereof" and insert "two new paragraphs,".

Page 2, line 8, strike out the quotation marks and insert:

(4) The reserve acreage made available for 1955 in any State for apportionment to farms operated by persons who have not produced rice during the preceding 5 years or on which rice has not been planted in the preceding 5 years shall not be less than five hundred acres; and the additional acreage necessary to provide such minimum reserve acreages shall be in addition to the National and State acreage allotments.

STATEMENT

The purpose of H. R. 4647 is to bring some measure of relief to rice farmers now confronting severe hardships due to a sharp reduction in the 1955 acreage for this important food crop.

This bill increases each of the State acreage allotments for rice in 1955 by 5 percent and contains a provision to remedy special conditions relating to new growers in South Carolina and Oklahoma.

Need for this action has developed, not through any fault of farmers, but from application of acreage allotments necessitated by increased supplies of rice and a constantly changing international situation.

The committee points out that as recently as 1953 the Department of State and the Department of Defense were encouraging larger rice production in the United States by emphasizing the importance of this food to our policies in the Far East.

Rice acreage allotments, in effect in 1950, were abandoned as the Korean conflict brought demands for larger production. At the end of that conflict our supplies began to accumulate.

The Secretary of Agriculture last December proclaimed a national rice acreage allotment of 1,859,099 acres for the 1955 crop, a 24.7 percent reduction from the 2,475,000 acres planted in 1954, and he called for marketing quotas for the rice produced on the restricted 1955 acreage. Growers voted approval of the quotas in an effort to bring their production into line with domestic and world demand for rice.

Subsequently it became evident in the ricegrowing States that so large a reduction in 1 year would result in inequities and in severe hardships for many growers. This legislation seeks to cushion the economic shock to these growers by a more gradual downward adjustment of allotted acreage.

This is the same consideration given to wheat and cotton farmers in legislation previously enacted by the Congress to provide a more gradual reduction of acreages in these crops.

The growth of importance of rice in the agriculture of our country is indicated by the fact that our production of rough rice over the past 20 years has increased from 17,800,000 hundredweight in 1935 to 59,100,000 in 1954, and the United States now is the third largest exporter of rice.

It is important that we prevent undue economic strain on our farmers who have brought about this growth of production in this food crop.

While it is recognized that H. R. 4647 will not alleviate all hardships among growers, it will afford very substantial relief with only a small increase in overall rice production.

Moreover, the committee points out that with the increase in acreage provided by this bill the production of rice in the United States will be approximately 47 million hundredweight against an estimated domestic and export disappearance of 53 million, meaning that in the 1955 crop year our accumulations of rice should be reduced by about 6 million hundredweight.

The following table shows for each State affected by the bill:

- (col. 1) 1954 planted rice acreage; (col. 2) 1955 State rice acreage allotments; (col. 3) 1955 State allotments increased by 5 percent, and (col. 4) additional acreage resulting from 5-percent increases in 1955 State allotments.

Rice: Comparison between 1955 State acreage allotments and proposed increased 1955 State acreage allotments as related to 1954 State plantings

State	1954 planted rice acreage	1955 State rice acreage allotment	1955 State al- lotment in- creased by 5 percent	Additional acreage re- sulting from 5-percent in- creases in 1955 State allotment
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Arkansas.....	613,000	435,639	457,421	21,782
California.....	485,000	343,362	360,530	17,168
Louisiana.....	656,000	519,634	545,616	25,982
Texas.....	624,000	486,522	510,848	24,326
Mississippi.....	84,000	47,499	49,874	2,375
Missouri.....	9,020	3,905	4,100	195
South Carolina.....	3,242	2,224	2,335	111
Florida.....	755	1,075	1,129	54
Tennessee.....	667	593	623	30
Arizona.....	0	47	49	2
Illinois.....	30	8	8	0
Sum of State allotments.....	2,475,714	1,840,508	1,932,533	92,025
National acreage reserve.....		18,591	18,591	
National acreage allotment.....		1,859,099	1,951,124	

ANALYSIS OF THE BILL

The new paragraph (3) added to section 353 (c) will require an increase of 5 percent in the 1955 rice acreage allotment for each State receiving a rice allotment. In States where State allotments are allocated to the counties, the additional allotment will be allocated on the same basis as the previously determined 1955 allotment, except that there will be no adjustment for trends in county allotments.

The new paragraph (4) added by the bill will apply to only two States—South Carolina and Oklahoma. Its purpose is to provide an allotment of 500 acres for each of these States to be used to the extent needed for new ricegrowers in those States who have prepared for production in 1955 but otherwise would be unable to obtain a 1955 acreage allotment.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with clause 3 of rule XIII of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law made by the bill are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets; new matter is in italics; existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938

* * * * *

TITLE III—PARITY PAYMENTS, CONSUMER SAFEGUARDS, AND
MARKETING QUOTAS

* * * * *

SEC. 353. * * *

(c) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act—

(1) If farm acreage allotments are established by using past production of rice on the farm and the acreage allotments previously established for the farm in lieu of past production of rice by the producer and the acreage allotments previously established for owners or operators, the State acreage allotment shall be apportioned among counties in the State on the same basis as the national acreage allotment is apportioned among the States and the county acreage allotments shall be apportioned to farms on the basis of the applicable factors set forth in subsection (b) of this section: *Provided*, That the State committee may reserve not to exceed 5 per centum of the State allotment, which shall be used to make adjustments in county allotments for trends in acreage and for abnormal conditions affecting plantings;

(2) Any acreage planted to rice in excess of the farm acreage allotment shall not be taken into account in establishing State, county, and farm acreage allotments (7 U. S. C. 1353 (c)).

(3) *Each of the State acreage allotments for 1955 heretofore proclaimed by the Secretary shall be increased by five per centum. In any State having county acreage allotments for 1955 the increase in the State allotment shall be apportioned among counties in the State on the same basis as the State allotment was heretofore apportioned among the counties, but without regard to adjustments for trends in acreage. The increases in the county acreage allotments and the increases in the State allotments, where county allotments are not determined, shall be used to establish farm acreage allotments which are fair and reasonable in relation to the applicable allotment factors specified in subsection (b) of this section and to correct inequities and prevent hardships.*

(4) *The reserve acreage made available for 1955 in any State for apportionment to farms operated by persons who have not produced rice during the preceding 5 years or on which rice has not been planted in the preceding 5 years shall not be less than five hundred acres; and the additional acreage necessary to provide such minimum reserve acreages shall be in addition to the National and State acreage allotments.*

○

Union Calendar No. 57

84TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 4647

[Report No. 237]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MARCH 7, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

MARCH 18, 1955

Reported with amendments, committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed

[Omit the part struck through and insert the part printed in italic]

A BILL

To amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That section 353 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of
4 1938, as amended, is amended by adding a new paragraph
5 ~~(3)~~ to subsection (c) thereof, *two new paragraphs* reading
6 as follows:

7 “(3) Each of the State acreage allotments for 1955
8 heretofore proclaimed by the Secretary shall be increased by
9 five per centum. In any State having county acreage allot-

1 ments for 1955 the increase in the State allotment shall be
2 apportioned among counties in the State on the same basis
3 as the State allotment was heretofore apportioned among
4 the counties, but without regard to adjustments for trends
5 in acreage. The increases in the county acreage allotments
6 and the increases in the State allotments, where county al-
7 lotments are not determined, shall be used to establish farm
8 acreage allotments which are fair and reasonable in relation
9 to the applicable allotment factors specified in subsection (b)
10 of this section and to correct inequities and prevent ~~hard-~~
11 ~~ships.~~ hardships.

12 “(4) The reserve acreage made available for 1955 in
13 any State for apportionment to farms operated by persons who
14 have not produced rice during the preceding five years
15 or on which rice has not been planted in the preceding five
16 years shall not be less than five hundred acres; and the
17 additional acreage necessary to provide such minimum reserve
18 acreages shall be in addition to the National and State acreage
19 allotments.”

84TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 4647

[Report No. 237]

A BILL

To amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas

MARCH 7, 1955

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

MARCH 18, 1955

Reported with amendments, committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued March 23, 1955
For actions of March 22, 1955
84th-1st, No. 51

CONTENTS

Acreage allotments.....1,7	Fruits and vegetables	Reclamation.....14
Alaska.....11	11,28	Research.....25
Appropriations.....20	Health.....4	Rice.....1
Chemicals in food.....4	Herbicide.....15	Roads.....16,22
Civil defense.....20	Imports.....11,21	Rubber.....66,9,19
Commodity exchanges.....2	Information.....17	Small business.....10
Cotton.....7,19,24	Labor, farm.....20	Social security.....20
Crop damage.....15	Lands, public.....3	Statistics.....20
Drought relief.....12	Legislative program...7,19	Surplus commodities.....35
Education.....20	Livestock and meats..11,21	Surplus property.....31
Electrification.....14	Onions.....2	Taxation.....32
Extension work.....20	Organization,	Technical assistance...17
Farm machinery.....32	executive.....5,8	Textiles.....25
Farm program.....13,26	Personnel.....5,19,20,34	Tobacco.....1
Feed.....12	Postal rates.....33	Trade agreements.....24
Food.....4,20	Price supports.....26	Transportation.....16
Foreign affairs.....13,17	Public works.....30	Weather.....11
Foreign trade.....35	Purchasing.....29	Wheat.....12,27
Forestry.....3	REA.....23	

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate debated cotton-allotment increase bill. Senate agreed to House amendment to bill to continue Reorganization Act. House Rules Committee cleared bills to redetermine burley tobacco allotments and increase rice allotments. House committee reported bill to include onions under CEA.

HOUSE

1. ~~RICE; TOBACCO.~~ The Rules Committee reported resolutions providing for the consideration of H. R. 4647, to increase the State rice acreage allotments for 1955 by 5%, and H. R. 4951, to redetermine the national marketing quota for ~~burley tobacco for the 1955-6 marketing year (p. 2913).~~
2. COMMODITY EXCHANGES. The Agriculture Committee reported without amendment H. R. 122, to include onions under the CEAct (H. Rept. 285)(p. 2924).
3. PUBLIC LANDS. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee ordered reported H. R. 2679, to amend the act to protect scenic values along Oak Creek Canyon and certain tributaries thereof within the Coconino National Forest, Ariz. (p. D234).
4. CHEMICALS IN FOOD. Rep. Willis expressed concern over the use of chemicals in food "in those cases where chemicals added to food create a health hazard," and he inserted a report of the National Research Council on the use of artificial sweeteners in food (pp. 2915-8).

5. PERSONNEL. Both Houses received from HEW a proposed bill to authorize an additional Assistant Secretary in that Department (pp. 2790, 2924).
6. RUBBER. Rejected, 132 to 283, H. Res. 170, declaring that the House of Representatives does not favor sale of the facilities as recommended in the report of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission submitted to Congress on Jan. 24, 1955 (pp. 2865-912).

SENATE

7. COTTON ALLOTMENTS. Began debate on H. R. 3952, to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 regarding cotton allotments. The bill as reported would increase the 1955 allotment by approximately 258,625 acres (the House version provides a 3% increase of approximately 543,234 acres) and would allot to each State an amount necessary to increase each farm allotment to the smaller of 4 acres or 75% of the highest acreage planted in 1952, 1953, or 1954. In addition each State would receive further acreage equal to one-half percent of its present allotment. Sen. Stennis (for himself and Sens. McClellan and Fulbright) submitted an amendment to the committee amendment so as to provide a 1½% (271,000 acres) allotment increase for 1955. This amendment was pending at recess for consideration today, Mar. 23, and a record vote has been ordered. Sen. Anderson and others submitted an amendment to increase the allotments for Ariz., Calif., Ill., Nev., and N. Mex. by 2% or to 3,500 acres, whichever results in the larger acreage. Sen. Malone submitted an amendment to allot to certain States not less than 10,000 acres in any year in which allotments are made. Sen. Daniel (for himself and Sen. Johnson) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to this bill. (pp. 2802, 2811-2, 2824-5, 2828-33, 2836-43).
8. REORGANIZATION. Agreed to the House amendment to H. R. 2576, to continue the Reorganization Act of 1949 to June 1, 1957 (p. 2804). This bill will now be sent to the President.
9. RUBBER. The Banking and Currency Committee reported adversely S. Res. 76, disapproving the sale of the facilities as recommended in the report of Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission (S. Rept. 117); and S. Res. 78 and 79, disapproving the sale of three synthetic-rubber-producing plants in Calif. (S. Rept. 118)(p. 2796).
10. SMALL BUSINESS. Received the report of the Small Business Administration covering operations between Aug. 1, 1954 and Jan. 31, 1955 (p. 2790).
11. MEAT IMPORTS; CHERRY IMPORTS; WEATHER CONTROL; ALASKA. Received various State Legislature memorials, etc., favoring immediate action to stop the importation of canned hams from Communist-dominated countries, urging retention of the present duty on cherry imports, prohibiting seeding of clouds or use of other methods to induce rain or snowfall until sufficient scientific data are collected to make effective regulation possible; and favoring extension of rectangular surveys in Alaska and granting to the Territory the same right as has been granted other States under the Submerged Land Act of May 23, 1953 (pp. 2790-2).

CONSIDERATION OF H. R. 4647

MARCH 22, 1955.—Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

Mr. TRIMBLE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following

R E P O R T

[To accompany H. Res. 190]

The Committee on Rules, having had under consideration House Resolution 190, report the same to the House with the recommendation that the resolution do pass.



1895

1895

1895

1895

1895

1895

1895

1895

House Calendar No. 30

84TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. RES. 190

[Report No. 292]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MARCH 22, 1955

Mr. TRIMBLE, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following resolution;
which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

RESOLUTION

1 *Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it
2 shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into
3 the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union
4 for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4647) to amend the
5 rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjust-
6 ment Act of 1938, as amended. After general debate,
7 which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not
8 to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by
9 the chairman and ranking minority member of the Commit-
10 tee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under
11 the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration
12 of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and re-

1 port the bill to the House with such amendments as may have
2 been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered
3 as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final pass-
4 age without intervening motion except one motion to
5 recommit.

House Calendar No. 30

84TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. RES. 190

[Report No. 292]

RESOLUTION

Providing for the consideration of H. R. 4647,
a bill to amend the rice marketing quota pro-
visions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act
of 1938, as amended.

By Mr. TRIMBLE

MARCH 22, 1955

Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be
printed

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued March 24, 1955
For actions of March 23, 1955
84th-1st, No. 52

CONTENTS

Acreage allotments..1,9,10	Housing, farm.....33	Reclamation..8,15,17,22,29
Appropriations.....38	Information.....16	Research.....20,27
Committee assignments...13	Labor, farm.....30	Rice.....10
Commodity exchange.....31	Legislative program.....9	Rubber.....3,11
Cotton.....1,9	Loans.....12	Sugar.....21
Dairy products.....4,32	Marketing.....2	Surplus commodities..23,37
Economic report.....26	Military training.....7	Tobacco.....9
Education.....16	Newsprint.....20	Trade agreements.....6
Electrification...14,17,24	Organization, executive.12	T.V.A.....14
Farm credit.....34	Personnel..5,7,9,18,35,39	Water research.....27
Farm program.....28	Prices.....36	Water utilization.....22
Food supply.....37	Price supports.....25	Wheat.....2,23
Forestry.....19		

HIGHLIGHTS: House passed bill to increase rice allotments. Senate debated cotton-allotment increase bill. Senate committee reported bill to exempt feed wheat producers from marketing quotas. Sen. Humphrey introduced and discussed bill to include onions under CEA.

SENATE

1. COTTON ALLOTMENTS. Continued debate on H. R. 3952, to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 regarding cotton allotments, after the bill had been temporarily put aside for action on legislation respecting sale of rubber-producing facilities. The Stennis amendment (see Digest 51), on which a record vote has been ordered, was pending at recess for consideration today, Mar. 24. (pp. 27-8, 2987-88.) The Agriculture and Forestry Committee agreed to an amendment to be offered as a committee amendment to this bill, which would strike the provision which provides further additional acreage equal to $\frac{1}{2}$ of 1% of each State's share of the national acreage allotment apportioned prior to enactment of this bill, and would further provide that in drought areas or in other disaster areas, a farmer may transfer his allotment from one farm to another. The amendment would further provide that no State allotment would be less than 3,500 acres. (p. D237.)
2. WHEAT. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported without amendment S. 46, to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 so as to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the Act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed on the farm (S. Rept. 119) (p. 2929).

3. RUBBER. Rejected S. Res. 76, disapproving the sale of the facilities as recommended in the report of Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission; and S. Res. 78 and 79, disapproving the sale of three synthetic-rubber-producing plants in Calif. (pp. 2935-74, 2977-85).
4. DAIRY PRODUCTS. Sen. Aiken expressed the hope that the Rules and Administration Committee will reconsider its decision not to permit milk to be sold through vending machines in the Senate Office Building and the Capitol, and stated that the Republican Policy Committee has unanimously voted in favor of installing milk-vending machines in these buildings (p. 2980).
5. PERSONNEL. Sen. Byrd submitted amendments intended to be proposed to S. 67, to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government (p. 2933).
6. TRADE AGREEMENTS. Sen. Payne submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to H. R. 1, to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (p. 2933).
7. MILITARY TRAINING. Sen. Wiley inserted a letter from the department commander of the Wis. American Legion supporting S. 2, to provide for the operation of the National Security Training Corps, etc. (p. 2935).
8. RECLAMATION. Sen. Watkins commended the support of CIO of S. 500, to authorize the Colorado River storage project, and inserted a recent CIO news release and statements by wildlife and conservation experts on this subject (pp. 2974-7).
9. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM for today, Mar. 24, as stated in the "Daily Digest": Continue consideration of cotton acreage allotment bill, to be followed by bills to increase pay of Federal employees (p. D237). Majority Leader Johnson also announced that "we also plan to consider at the earliest possible date on which we can sandwich them in" bills relating to tobacco allotments (p. 2983).

HOUSE

10. RICE ALLOTMENTS. Passed as reported H. R. 4647, to amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 so as to increase by 5% the 1955 rice acreage allotments for each State receiving a rice allotment; allocate, in those States where State allotments are allocated to the counties, the additional allotment on the same basis as the previously determined 1955 allotments, except that there would be no adjustment for trends in county allotments; and provide allotment of 500 acres to S. C. and Okla., to be used to the extent needed for new rice growers in those States who have prepared for production in 1955 (p. 3037).
11. RUBBER. Rejected, 137 to 276, H. Res. 171, to disapprove the proposed sale to the Shell Oil Co. of certain Government-owned synthetic rubber producing facilities as recommended by the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission (pp. 2993-3005).

84TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 4647

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MARCH 24 (legislative day, MARCH 10), 1955

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

AN ACT

To amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That section 353 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of
4 1938, as amended, is amended by adding to subsection (c)
5 thereof, two new paragraphs reading as follows:

6 “(3) Each of the State acreage allotments for 1955
7 heretofore proclaimed by the Secretary shall be increased by
8 five per centum. In any State having county acreage allot-
9 ments for 1955 the increase in the State allotment shall be
10 apportioned among counties in the State on the same basis

1 as the State allotment was heretofore apportioned among
2 the counties, but without regard to adjustments for trends
3 in acreage. The increases in the county acreage allotments
4 and the increases in the State allotments, where county al-
5 lotments are not determined, shall be used to establish farm
6 acreage allotments which are fair and reasonable in relation
7 to the applicable allotment factors specified in subsection (b)
8 of this section and to correct inequities and prevent hardships.

9 “(4) The reserve acreage made available for 1955 in
10 any State for apportionment to farms operated by persons who
11 have not produced rice during the preceding five years
12 or on which rice has not been planted in the preceding five
13 years shall not be less than five hundred acres; and the
14 additional acreage necessary to provide such minimum reserve
15 acreages shall be in addition to the National and State acreage
16 allotments.”

Passed the House of Representatives March 23, 1955.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS,

Clerk.

84TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 4647

AN ACT

To amend the rice marketing quota provisions
of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938,
as amended.

MARCH 24 (legislative day, MARCH 10), 1955

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Agriculture and Forestry

will make Congressmen conduct hearings perfectly. This is a matter of personal conduct and activity. But my resolution sets forth a short standard of conduct which it is believed will be helpful and fair to all.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

Mr. KEATING. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 190) providing for the consideration of H. R. 4647, a bill to amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4647) to amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRIMBLE. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to inform my colleagues that this bill will be the final business today. Tomorrow we meet at 11 o'clock on the Interior Department appropriation bill. Then we will consider the bill from the Committee on Ways and Means repealing certain sections of the Revenue Act of last year and also the Burley Tobacco bill. If they are disposed of tomorrow, we will go over until Monday. As I said, however, this is the last legislative business tonight.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown] and yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution (H. Res. 190) makes in order the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4647) to amend the rice-marketing-quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as

amended. The resolution was reported unanimously by the Committee on Rules and was also reported unanimously by the Committee on Agriculture. It simply refers to the order by the Secretary of Agriculture which incidentally seems to be the common practice of all the Secretaries in late years of cutting down the quotas. In this instance, the quotas were cut 25 percent and this bill will add 5 percent to the quota of each State which will result in a cut of 20 percent instead of 25 percent for each State.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no objection to the rule.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as has been explained by the gentleman from Ar-Kansas, House Resolution 190 makes in order the consideration of H. R. 4647 under an open rule. This measure will amend the rice-marketing-quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. It was reported unanimously by the Committee on Agriculture. The rule was adopted unanimously by the House Committee on Rules. It seemingly is not a controversial measure. I have no requests for time and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, my good friend and colleague from Ohio has not violated the rules of the House, but he has violated the laws of the State of Arkansas when he refers to me as the gentleman from Ar-Kansas.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If the gentleman will yield, if it were proper, I could make quite a long speech on the great State of Arkansas, but since it would be quite long and since the gentleman may have heard it, I will not do so.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution. The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 4647) to amend the rice-marketing-quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 353 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding a new paragraph (3) to subsection (c) thereof, reading as follows:

"(3) Each of the State acreage allotments for 1955 heretofore proclaimed by the Secretary shall be increased by 5 percent. In any State having county acreage allotments for 1955 the increase in the State allotment shall be apportioned among counties in the State on the same basis as the State allotment was heretofore apportioned among the counties, but without regard to adjustments for trends in acreage. The increases in the county acreage allotments and the increases in the State allotments, where county allotments are not determined, shall be used to establish farm acreage allotments which are fair and reasonable in relation to the applicable allotment factors specified in subsection (b) of this section and to correct inequities and prevent hardships."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, lines 4 and 5, strike out "a new paragraph (3)."

Page 1, line 5, after the word "thereof", insert "two new paragraphs."

Page 2, line 10, after the word "prevent", strike out "hardships." and insert "hardships."

Page 2, line 12, insert the following:

"(4) The reserve acreage made available for 1955 in any State for apportionment to farms operated by persons who have not produced rice during the preceding 5 years or on which rice has not been planted in the preceding 5 years shall not be less than 500 acres; and the additional acreage necessary to provide such minimum reserve acreages shall be in addition to the National and State acreage allotments."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment the Members of the House Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMPSON] and the members of his subcommittee as well as the Democratic whip, Congressman CARL ALBERT, of Oklahoma, for the excellent work they have done in presenting this worthwhile bill which has passed the House of Representatives today. This measure will correct several inequities and will give the State of Oklahoma a new quota of 500 acres for the growth of rice.

Early in February State Senator Charles Wilson advised me that two farmers in my district—Mr. Cletis Killian and Mr. Homer Holcomb, of Beckham County—were anxious to grow rice in LeFlore County, Okla. This measure will make this possible. This is another new crop for Oklahoma. Another crop which should be greatly expanded is mung beans. About 95 percent of the mung beans grown in Oklahoma are grown in the Sixth Congressional District.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have the right to extend their remarks in the RECORD following the vote on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER TRANSFERRED

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order entered for me today be transferred to Monday next, at the close of the legislative business of the day and other special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

REPEALING SECTIONS 452 AND 462 OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

Mr. COLMER, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 191, Rept. No. 294),

which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4725) to repeal sections 452 and 462 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, and said amendments shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding. Amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means may be offered to any section of the bill at the conclusion of the general debate, but said amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

CORRECTION OF ROLL CALL

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, on roll call 26 of yesterday I am registered as absent. I was present and answered to my name. I ask unanimous consent that the Journal and permanent Record be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

AMERICAN COMMITTEE FOR PROTECTION OF THE FOREIGN BORN

(Mr. WALTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, many members of the Communist Party are coming to Washington, D. C., this Sunday and Monday. They are not coming under their banner of red, but they are coming under the banner of yellow. They are coming under the title of the American Committee for Protection of the Foreign Born. They will not come under their real designation, namely, the Communist Party.

Why are they coming here? Not to be a part of the Cherry Blossom Festival, but, rather, to present to this Congress and Members of the House and Senate, petitions for the repeal of the Walter-McCarran law. They also plan to personally call upon Members and dictate what they, the Communist Party, demand in the way of amendments to the Walter-McCarran law.

Mr. Speaker, the American Committee for Protection of the Foreign Born was formed by the Communist Party around the year 1935. It was formed for the purpose for which it is being used today, the protection of Communists who have

become involved in violation of the immigration laws. Today, they attack the Walter-McCarran law; yesterday it was some other law or official who was proceeding against members of the Communist Party. This committee is run today by its executive secretary, Abner Green. Green, who has always run the organization, irrespective of the names placed on their letterhead, is the same Abner Green who was a trustee of the Communist bail bond fund. In 1951, he and the other trustees were sentenced to jail for contempt of court for refusing to divulge the source of the bail fund. Not only does Green front for the Communist Party, but he is or has been a member of the nationality commission of the Communist Party.

Sworn testimony has been received to the effect that the nationality commission of the Communist Party meets and decides the policy of the American Committee for Protection of the Foreign Born. Little wonder that this organization is always found to be interested in only the immigration problems of members of the Communist Party.

This gathering to be held in Washington, named a legislative conference by one segment of the American committee and more properly named a nationwide lobby by the Michigan committee, was decided upon by the Communist Party as the most effective way of blackmailing the Congress. The kickoff took place at a meeting of the New York committee as announced in the Daily Worker of January 9. This meeting, which was addressed by Communists such as the convicted Carl Marzani, set the stage. The printed petitions, which we shall receive next Monday, were distributed.

Through this meeting the American committee put forth the demands of the Communist Party as amendments to the Walter-McCarran law. These amendments are in the main: Citizenship for aliens after 2 years' United States residence; no deportation for any reason if an alien has lived in the United States for at least 5 years; and no denaturalization action unless citizenship was obtained by fraud. Except for the faster citizenship, these recommendations cannot benefit the loyal and desirable alien. They can be of aid only to the disloyal, Communists, and criminals alike.

Following the New York kickoff, the other State committees for protection of the foreign born took their cue. In Philadelphia, Chicago, and Detroit, to name a few, the Pennsylvania, Illinois, and Michigan committees started their propaganda machines. Michigan called a State conference to repeal the Walter-McCarran Act. At this conference, they lined up their Communists to make the trip to Washington. They lined up their propaganda and petitions for the Michigan delegation in Congress. Michigan differed from the meetings held in other localities only in the names of the people fronting for the Communist Party. The boss was here again another top functionary of the Communist Party. He is the executive secretary of the Michigan Committee for Protection of the Foreign Born. He is Saul Grossman, and he is personally known to this Congress. He

refused to answer as to his Communist Party membership while a witness before the Committee on Un-American Activities in 1952. He was cited for contempt of the Congress for his refusal to produce the books and records of this same Michigan committee. He has been found guilty and is presently free on bail, from a year's sentence for this contempt.

These are the people who will call upon us next Monday. These are the people who claim to represent that which is best for America.

At their meeting in New York, they claimed that the 59 Communist deportation and denaturalization cases which they represented were 59 reasons to repeal the Walter-McCarran law. In Michigan, they claim to represent 100 cases. Not one of these cases represents an individual not connected with the Communist Party.

I have followed the cases handled by the American Committee for Protection of the Foreign Born and its State committees for these last 20 years. Like their current cases, their previous cases have been in behalf of members of the Communist Party. I have been unable to find one case handled by them where the defendant was not associated with the Communist Party. Perhaps the delegates calling upon House Members will be able to name one, although I doubt it.

TVA'S YARDSTICK IS DEAD

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, some 20 years ago when the Halls of Congress echoed with the debate on a bill to establish the all-powerful Tennessee Valley Authority, the New Deal wordmongers coined the magic phrase "yardstick" to rationalize a Government TVA scheme for going into an out-and-out business operation.

Faint though the voices of opposition were in those days, there could be no denial of their contention that it was not in the American pattern that the sovereign Government should enter into competition with its own private citizens in a legitimate business venture—hence this notion that the Government would only be setting an example so that private industry could see how cheaply electricity and fertilizer could be manufactured by a nontaxpaying Government authority.

And so, midst these hectic times, the Tennessee Valley Authority Act was finally passed under the guise of a vast natural resources development—including flood control, soil conservation, navigation improvement—all established functions of Government—with the incidental business of generating and distributing electric power greatly soft-pedalled.

As the years went by and the TVA officials began their annual pilgrimages to Washington seeking appropriations to expand their power empire, the yardstick argument came more and more in evi-

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued April 21, 1955
For actions of April 20, 1955
84th-1st, No. 65

CONTENTS

Achievement award.....23	Experiment stations.....28	Organization, executive...29
A.C.P.....10	Farm relief.....11,31	Personnel.....17,23
Acreage allotments...10,11	Flood control.....33	Price supports.....19
Agricultural appropriations.....16	Foreign aid.....2,22,34,36	Reclamation.....3,33,37
Agricultural Stabilization Committee.....14,18	Forestry.....7,20,32	Rice.....6,36
Appropriations.....1,15,16	Lands, transfer.....12	Soil conservation.....10,22
Dairy industry.....30	Legislative program.....16	Sugar.....35
Disaster relief.....11,31	Livestock loans.....8	Tobacco.....13
Education.....23	Loans, farm.....8,21,25	Trade agreements.....5,16
Electrification, rural9,15,22,30	Loyalty Day.....4	Water conservation.....22,26
	Marketing.....24,27	Wheat.....24
	Monopolies.....19	Wind erosion control.....1
	Natural resources.....22	

HIGHLIGHTS: Both Houses agreed to conference report on 2nd supplemental appropriation bill. Both Houses received President's foreign aid message. Senate passed Colorado reclamation bill. Senate committee reported bills to: amend rice-quota provisions, authorize sale of forest tracts, continue livestock-loans program, repeal REA State formula, repeal tie-in of ACP with acreage allotments, provide additional acreage allotments for freeze areas, etc. Senate committee ordered reported measure directing USDA to study burley tobacco problem. House passed postal pay raise bill. Rep. Moulder urged investigation of Mo. Agricultural Stabilization Committee's methods. Sens. Carlson and Morse introduced and discussed bills to provide two-price wheat plan. Sens. Johnston and Thurmond introduced, and Sen. Thurmond discussed, bills to limit interest on certain farm loans to 3%. Rep. Gathings commended Secretary's handling of Japanese rice negotiations.

SENATE

1. SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1955. Both Houses agreed to the conference report on this bill, H. R. 4903, and acted on amendments which had been reported in disagreement (pp. 4079-80, 4082-4). The House concurred in the Senate amendment regarding the wind erosion control item. For other items of interest to this Department, see Digest 64. This bill will now be sent to the President.
2. FOREIGN AID. Both Houses received the President's message recommending continuation of the Mutual Security Program under an International Cooperation Administration in the State Department; to Senate Foreign Relations Committee and House Foreign Affairs Committee (H. Doc. 144)(pp. 4080, 4084-6).
3. RECLAMATION. Passed, 58-23, with amendments S. 500, to authorize the Colorado River storage project (pp. 4048-73).
4. LOYALTY DAY. Passed without amendment H. J. Res. 184, to designate May 1, 1955,

as Loyalty Day (p. 4073). This measure will now be sent to the President.

5. TRADE AGREEMENTS. The Finance Committee made additional tentative decisions regarding various provisions of H. R. 1, the trade agreements bill (p. D311).
6. RICE QUOTAS. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported ~~without amendment~~ H. R. 2839 (S. Rept. 213) and H. R. 4356 (S. Rept. 214), and with amendments H. R. 4647 (S. Rept. 211), to amend various provisions of the rice marketing quota laws (p. 4031).
7. FORESTRY. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported with amendments S. 1079, to authorize sale of isolated or protruding tracts of national forest land (S. Rept. 207)(p. 4031).
8. LIVESTOCK LOANS. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported without amendment S. 1372, to amend the act of April 6, 1949, to extend the period for emergency assistance to farmers and stockmen (S. Rept. 208)(p. 4031).
9. RURAL ELECTRIFICATION. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported with amendment S. 153, to amend the Rural Electrification Act so as to eliminate the requirement that not more than 10% of the loans may be made in any one State (S. Rept. 209)(p. 4031).
10. SOIL CONSERVATION; ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported without amendment H. R. 1573, to repeal the requirement that farmers must comply with acreage allotments on basic crops in order to be eligible for ACP payments (S. Rept. 210).
11. ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS; FARM RELIEF. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported with amendments S. 1628, to provide relief to farmers and farmworkers suffering crop losses or loss of employment because of damage to crops caused by drought, flood, hail, frost, freeze, wind, insect infestation, plant disease, or other natural causes (S. Rept. 206)(p. 4031).
12. LAND TRANSFER. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported without amendment S. 998, to authorize conveyance of a tract of ARS land to Woodward, Okla. (S. Rept. 212)(p. 4031).
The Agriculture and Forestry Committee ordered reported H. J. Res. 107, to permit Federal release of reversionary rights in certain former FHA land located at Kern County, Calif. (p. D310).
13. TOBACCO. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee ordered reported S. J. Res. 60, directing the Secretary of Agriculture to make a study and report regarding burley tobacco marketing controls (p. D310).
14. AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION COMMITTEE. Received a Mo. State legislature resolution requesting the USDA to investigate the activities of the Mo. State ASC committee in the dismissals of duly elected local committeemen, the suspension of the William Young McCaskill and Smith Feed Co. as certified drought feed dealers, etc. (pp. 4029-30).
15. ELECTRIFICATION. Sen. Neuberger spoke in favor of increased appropriations for the John Day Dam, Columbia River, and inserted an Oregonian editorial on this subject (p. 4080).

EMERGENCY RICE ALLOTMENTS FOR 1955

APRIL 20 (legislative day, APRIL 18), 1955.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry,
submitted the following

R E P O R T

[To accompany H. R. 4647]

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4647), to amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, having considered the same, report thereon with a recommendation that it do pass with amendments.

This bill, with the committee amendments, would (1) increase each 1955 State rice-acreage allotment 2 percent, (2) provide each State with a 1955 rice allotment at least equal to its 1950 allotment, (3) provide each county whose base acreage for 1955 exceeded by at least 2 percent its base acreage for 1950 with a 1955 rice allotment at least equal to its 1950 allotment, and (4) increase each State reserve for new producers and new farms to a minimum of 500 acres.

The purpose of the bill is to relieve hardship resulting from the sharp reduction in rice acreage required by the 1955 allotment, 1955 being the first year since 1950 for which a rice allotment has been effective. The national allotment of 1,859,099 acres represents a 24.7 percent reduction from the 2,475,000 acres planted in 1954. Your committee believes that a more gradual reduction in acreage will accomplish the desired reduction in supplies without such severe hardship to growers.

The committee amendments would reduce to 2 percent the 5-percent increase in State allotments provided by the House bill and incorporate the provisions described in clauses (2) and (3) of the first paragraph of this report, which were taken from S. 1061 introduced by Senator Ellender, and S. 882 introduced by Senator Fulbright. The provision described in clause (4) above is identical in substance with S. 692 introduced by Senators Johnston and Thurmond of South Carolina. The purpose of the committee amendments is to take care of the hardships and inequities which have arisen in the

various rice-growing areas without unduly increasing the national rice acreage.

The reports of the Department of Agriculture on S. 1061, S. 882, and S. 692 are attached.

DEPARTMENTAL VIEWS

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., March 18, 1955.

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
*Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry,
United States Senate.*

DEAR SENATOR ELLENDER: This acknowledges your letter of February 16, requesting a report on S. 1061, amending section 353 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide that no State rice-acreage allotment for 1955 shall be smaller than the 1950 acreage allotment for such State.

We do not recommend passage of this legislation.

The effect of this bill would be to increase the 1955 rice-acreage allotment for Louisiana approximately 37,800 acres with a corresponding increase in the national allotment. Apportionment of the national rice-acreage allotment among the States is required by law to be made in proportion to the average acreage in each State during the preceding 5-year period, with adjustments for trends in acreage. In the 1950-54 period, on which the 1955-crop allotments are based, the national average rice acreage, adjusted for trend, was 26 percent larger than in the 1945-49 period on which the 1950 allotments were based. Between these two base periods, the average acreage planted to rice in Louisiana, adjusted for trend, increased less than 2 percent. As a result, the 1955 allotment for Louisiana is smaller than the allotment for 1950. However, as compared with the 1954 acreage, the acreage reduction for Louisiana is only 21 percent, or less than the national average reduction of 24.7 percent called for under the 1955 allotment program.

In view of these facts, it would be difficult to justify S. 1061 on the ground of correcting an inequity. Moreover, the resulting added production would further widen the disparity between supplies and market outlets.

In view of the telephone request of March 18 that this report be submitted immediately, we have not obtained advice as to the relationship of this proposed legislation to the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

TRUE D. MORSE, *Acting Secretary.*

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., April 11, 1955.

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
*Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry,
United States Senate.*

DEAR SENATOR ELLENDER: This is in reply to your letter of February 2, 1955, requesting a report on S. 882, a bill to amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

We have no objection to passage of the bill.

The bill would amend section 353 of the act so as to provide a 1955 rice-acreage allotment of not less than the 1950 rice-acreage allotment for any country (for which rice-acreage allotments are established for 1955) in which the 1950-54 average planted acreage plus diverted acreage of rice, adjusted for trends in acreage, exceeds the 1945-49 average planted acreage, similarly adjusted, by more than 2 percent. Any additional acreage required to provide such minimum county allotments would be in addition to the National and State allotments of rice for 1955.

The purpose of the bill is to moderate the rice-acreage reductions called for under marketing quotas for Arkansas County, Ark., and Vermilion Parish, La., which received relatively small allotments because of the method required by legislation to be used for apportioning the national allotment to the States and the State allotments to the counties.

Although there was an uptrend in the rice acreage in each of these counties during the 5-year base period of 1950-54, the 1955 allotments for these counties are smaller than those established for 1950 because of shifts in acreage as between States and as between counties within States. In Arkansas County, Ark., a relatively small allotment resulted from the sharp uptrend in acreage in other counties of the State, which caused Arkansas County to lose the relative portion it held in the 5-year base period used in apportioning the 1950 State allotment; and in Vermilion Parish, La., the relatively large acreage reduction required under the 1955 program was entirely a reflection of a smaller State allotment for 1955.

The fact that producers in these counties are required, under penalty, to reduce their rice acreage below their allotment for 1950, when the total United States rice acreage was about 34 percent smaller than in 1954, is being construed as an inequity which S. 882 aims to correct. The provisions of the bill would increase the national rice-acreage allotment of 1,859,099 acres for 1955 by 10,220 acres, or less than six-tenths of 1 percent.

Although the Department does, in principle, disapprove of amending legislation to make inapplicable for the benefit of certain counties basic legislative provisions otherwise applicable to all counties, disparities of allotments between adjoining counties within a State are not in the interest of good program administration. Inasmuch as the provisions of S. 882 are limited to the 1955 allotment program and marketing quotas have been put into effect for the first time this year, the Department does not object to adjusting seeming inequities between county allotments for 1955 in the manner proposed.

Although S. 882 would principally apply to Arkansas County, Ark., and Vermilion Parish, La., some very minor allotment increases would accrue from the provisions of this bill to the parishes of Iberville and Morehouse, La.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that, from the standpoint of the program of the President, there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

TRUE D. MORSE, *Acting Secretary.*

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington 25, D. C., April 11, 1955.

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,

*Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry,
United States Senate.*

DEAR SENATOR ELLENDER: This acknowledges your letter of January 25, requesting a report on S. 692. The bill amends section 353 (c) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to make available for 1955 in any State in which rice was produced in the 1950-54 period a reserve acreage of not less than 500 acres for apportionment among farms operated by persons who will grow rice in 1955 for the first time since 1949. The additional acreage necessary to provide such minimum reserve is to be in addition to the National and State acreage allotments.

The Department has no objection to the enactment of this bill because of the following considerations:

The primary purpose of the bill is to give relief to South Carolina where two rice producers without previous rice-production history in the State established a rice mill. These producers produced rice in Georgia and Texas in the first 4 years of the 5-year period used in establishing farm-acreage allotments for 1955. Unless they can obtain a reasonable 1955 allotment on a new-farm basis in South Carolina these producers may be forced to move their mill back to Texas because of insufficient production for profitable operation of the mill. Also, other producers in South Carolina contend that removal of the mill from the State would jeopardize the entire rice industry in the area served by the mill.

Although rice production in the United States had its beginning in South Carolina, it was discontinued on a commercial basis in that State about 50 years ago. An effort was made to revive this industry by planting about 3,200 acres of rice in South Carolina in each of the last 3 years. The acreage reduction enforced under the marketing quota program for the 1955 crop of rice may result in most of the rice producers having to abandon rice production in South Carolina, the second largest rice-consuming State of the Nation.

The additional acreage required to be allotted to correct this situation would be about 1,200 acres, or less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the national rice-acreage allotment proclaimed. States other than South Carolina would derive small benefits from this bill. These States include Missouri, Florida, Tennessee, Arizona, and Illinois.

In general, the Department believes it is not equitable to make special legislative provision for relief in individual cases regarding acreage allotments, since such legislation might be construed as setting a precedent. However, we have no objection in this case because of the peculiar circumstances involved.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

TRUE D. MORSE, *Acting Secretary.*

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with subsection (4) of rule XXIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in *italic*, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938

* * * * *

TITLE III—PARITY PAYMENTS, CONSUMER SAFEGUARDS, AND MARKETING QUOTAS

* * * * *

SEC. 353. * * *

(c) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act—

(1) If farm acreage allotments are established by using past production of rice on the farm and the acreage allotments previously established for the farm in lieu of past production of rice by the producer and the acreage allotments previously established for owners or operators, the State acreage allotment shall be apportioned among counties in the State on the same basis as the national acreage allotment is apportioned among the States and the county acreage allotments shall be apportioned to farms on the basis of the applicable factors set forth in subsection (b) of this section: *Provided*, That the State committee may reserve not to exceed 5 per centum of the State allotment, which shall be used to make adjustments in county allotments for trends in acreage and for abnormal conditions affecting plantings;

(2) Any acreage planted to rice in excess of the farm acreage allotment shall not be taken into account in establishing State, county, and farm acreage allotments.

(3) *Each of the State acreage allotments for 1955 heretofore proclaimed by the Secretary shall be increased by 2 per centum or by such greater acreage as may be necessary to provide such State with an allotment equal to its 1950 allotment. In any State having county acreage allotments for 1955 (i) the increase in the State allotment shall be apportioned among counties in the State on the same basis as the State allotment was heretofore apportioned among the counties, but without regard to adjustments for trends in acreage, and (ii) the 1955 allotment for any county in which the 1950-1954 average planted plus diverted acreage of rice, adjusted for trends in acreage, exceeds the 1945-1949 average planted acreage of rice, similarly adjusted, by more than 2 per centum shall then be further increased by such additional acreage as may be necessary to provide such county with an allotment equal to its 1950 allotment. The increases in the county acreage allotments and the increases in the State allotments, where county allotments are not determined, shall be used to establish farm acreage allotments which are fair and reasonable in relation to the applicable allotment factors specified in subsection (b) of this section and to correct inequities and prevent hardships.*

(4) *The reserve acreage made available for 1955 in any State for apportionment to farms operated by persons who have not produced rice during the preceding five years or on which rice has not been planted in the preceding five years shall not be less than five hundred acres; and the additional acreage necessary to provide such minimum reserve acreages shall be in addition to the National and State acreage allotments.*

Calendar No. 213

84TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 4647

[Report No. 211]

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MARCH 24 (legislative day, MARCH 10), 1955

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

APRIL 20 (legislative day, APRIL 18), 1955

Reported by Mr. ELLENDER, with amendments

[Omit the part struck through and insert the part printed in italic]

AN ACT

To amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That section 353 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of
4 1938, as amended, is amended by adding to subsection (c)
5 thereof, two new paragraphs reading as follows:

6 “(3) Each of the State acreage allotments for 1955
7 heretofore proclaimed by the Secretary shall be increased by
8 ~~five per centum~~ *2 per centum or by such greater acreage*
9 *as may be necessary to provide such State with an allotment*
10 *equal to its 1950 allotment.* In any State having county
11 acreage allotments for ~~1955~~ *1955* (i) the increase in the

1 State allotment shall be apportioned among counties in the
2 State on the same basis as the State allotment was hereto-
3 fore apportioned among the counties, but without regard to
4 adjustments for trends in acreage, *and (ii) the 1955 allot-*
5 *ment for any county in which the 1950-1954 average planted*
6 *plus diverted acreage of rice, adjusted for trends in acreage,*
7 *exceeds the 1945-1949 average planted acreage of rice, simi-*
8 *larly adjusted, by more than 2 per centum shall then be*
9 *further increased by such additional acreage as may be nec-*
10 *essary to provide such county with an allotment equal to its*
11 *1950 allotment.* The increases in the county acreage allot-
12 ments and the increases in the State allotments, where
13 county allotments are not determined, shall be used to estab-
14 lish farm acreage allotments which are fair and reasonable
15 in relation to the applicable allotment factors specified in
16 subsection (b) of this section and to correct inequities and
17 prevent hardships.

18 “(4) The reserve acreage made available for 1955 in
19 any State for apportionment to farms operated by persons
20 who have not produced rice during the preceding five years
21 or on which rice has not been planted in the preceding five
22 years shall not be less than five hundred acres; and the

- 1 additional acreage necessary to provide such minimum re-
- 2 serve acreages shall be in addition to the National and State
- 3 acreage allotments.”

Passed the House of Representatives March 23, 1955.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS,

Clerk.

84TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 4647

[Report No. 211]

AN ACT

To amend the rice marketing quota provisions
of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938,
as amended.

MARCH 24 (legislative day, MARCH 10), 1955

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Agriculture and Forestry

APRIL 20 (legislative day, APRIL 18), 1955

Reported with amendments

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued April 26, 1955
For actions of April 25, 1955
84th-1st, No. 67

CONTENTS

Acreage allotments1,4,10,17,18	Forestry.....3,24,45	Property.....44
Agricultural appropriations.....8,45	Housing.....40,42	Reclamation.....15,33,43
Appropriations8,27,45,46,47	Labor.....21	Records.....38
Conservation acreage.....12	Land reform.....13	Rice.....4
Dairy industry.....20	Lands, public.....25	Roads.....28,45
Disaster relief1,22,39,45	transfer.....3,5,28	Soil conservation.....10
Education.....41	Livestock and meat.....2	Surplus commodities...31,42
Electrification, rural11,15,19,35	Loans, farm.....2,22,39	Territories and possessions.....25,28
Family-size farm.....34	Marketing.....37	Textile industry.....21
Foreign aid.....16,26,45	Monopolies.....29	Tobacco.....6
Foreign trade.....14,20,31	Organization, executive.....9,27	Trade agreements.....14
HIGHLIGHTS; Senate passed bills to:	Personnel7,13,23,32,36,45	Treaties.....28
allotments, divide joint rice allotments on basis of acreage, increase rice allotments, authorize additional acreage allotments for freeze areas, etc., continue livestock-loans authority, authorize sale of small forest tracts. Senate made USDA appropriation bill its unfinished business. Senate committee reported measure for USDA study of tobacco quotas. Both Houses received Hoover Commission report on food and clothing. Several Representatives criticized increased interest rate on disaster loans and decline in farm prices. Sen. Humphrey urged conservation acreage reserve. Sen. Humphrey urged land-reform support and referred to Ladejinsky.	Prices, farm.....22	Water utilization.....30
	support.....18	Wheat.....17
		Wind erosion control.....45

SENATE

1. ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS. Passed as reported S. 1628, to authorize the Department, until June 1, 1958, to make available additional acreage allotments to farmers whose crops are destroyed or severely damaged by freeze, drought, or other natural cause (pp. 4240, 4242-3).
2. LIVESTOCK LOANS. Passed without amendment S. 1372, to extend for two additional years the authority of the Department to provide emergency assistance to farmers and stockmen under the act of April 6, 1949 (pp. 4240-2).
3. FORESTRY. Passed with amendment S. 1079, which, as amended, provides "That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to sell at not less than the appraised value, and under such terms and conditions as he deems appropriate, lands in the national forests which are isolated parcels or narrow projecting strips, when he finds such lands suitable for private ownership and better adapted to commercial, agricultural, residential, or other private purposes than to national forest purposes" (pp. 4240, 4244-5).

4. RICE ALLOTMENTS. Passed without amendment H. R. 2839, providing for reapportionment of rice acreage allotments voluntarily surrendered to county committees (p. 4241). This bill will now be sent to the President.
Passed without amendment H. R. 4356, to provide that joint acreage allotments of rice be divided on the basis of acreage planted by each participant instead of on the basis of each participant's share of the crop (p. 4241). This bill will now be sent to the President.
-
- Passed as reported H. R. 4647, which would increase each 1955 State rice acreage allotment by 2%, provide each State with a 1955 rice allotment at least equal to its 1950 allotment, provide each county whose base acreage for 1955 exceeded by at least 2% its base acreage for 1950 with a 1955 rice allotment at least equal to its 1950 allotment, and increase each State reserve for new producers and new farms to a minimum of 500 acres (pp. 4241, 4243-4). As passed by the House, the bill would have increased rice allotments by 5%.
-
5. LAND TRANSFERS. Passed without amendment S. 998, directing the Department to sell a tract of ARS land to Woodward, Okla., for 50% of its value (p. 4241).
The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported without amendment H. J. Res. 107, to permit Federal release of reversionary rights to certain former FHA land to the Vineland School District, Kern County, Calif. (S. Rept. 223) (p. 4215).
6. TOBACCO. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported without amendment S. J. Res. 60, directing the Secretary of Agriculture, not later than July 1, 1955, to submit to Congress a report on the feasibility, cost, etc., of various types of burley tobacco controls (S. Rept. 224)(p. 4215).
7. PERSONNEL. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee reported without amendment S. 1094, to remove the limitation on the amount of appropriations which may be used by Federal agencies for uniform allowances (S. Rept. 222)(p. 4215).
Agreed to, as reported, S. Res. 33, to direct the Committee to investigate administration of the civil-service system by the Civil Service Commission and other Government agencies (p. 4232).
8. AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL FOR 1956, H. R. 5239, was made the unfinished business (p. 4239). Sen. Williams submitted an amendment which he intends to propose to this bill (p. 4225).
9. REORGANIZATION; MANAGEMENT. The Government Operations Committee reported without amendment S. 1763, to continue the Hoover Commission from May 31 through June 30, 1955, for liquidation purposes (S. Rept. 217)(p. 4215).
Received the annual report of the Government Operations Committee on its investigations (S. Rept. 231)(p. 4216).
Both Houses received the Hoover Commission report on "food and clothing in the Government" (H. Doc. 146); to Government Operations Committees (pp. 4204, 4207). This report will not be available from the Legislative Reporting Staff except for an emergency need. Pursuant to a special arrangement, each agency of the Department is ordering its own supply of the report directly from GPO.
10. SOIL CONSERVATION; ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS. Discussed and, at the request of Sen. Bible, passed over H. R. 1573, to repeal the provision prohibiting ACP payments to persons who do not adhere to acreage allotments on basic crops. Sen. Johnson indicated that this bill will soon be brought up for separate consideration, and Sen. Holland said he had no objection to such procedure but did not believe the bill should be considered on the calendar. (pp. 4241, 4244.)

of supplementary advances on loans at the time the extended period expires.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Would it be agreeable to the minority calendar committee if at the conclusion of the calendar call this bill be considered by the Senate.

Mr. HRUSKA. I have no objection to that.

Mr. PURTELL. I have no objection.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not believe that there will be any objection to placing in the bill a time limitation of the kind the Senator from Nebraska has reference to.

Mr. HRUSKA. A 2-year limitation would be agreeable to us.

Mr. ELLENDER. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the bill be placed at the foot of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana, that the bill be placed at the foot of the calendar?

Mr. PURTELL. We have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be placed at the foot of the calendar.

AMENDMENT OF RICE MARKETING QUOTA PROVISIONS—BILL PLACED AT FOOT OF CALENDAR

The bill (H. R. 4647) to amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I believe this bill involves a new policy, and therefore I object to the bill being considered at this time. I believe it should be debated on the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Would it be agreeable to the Senator if I moved to take it up at the conclusion of the call of the calendar?

Mr. PURTELL. I would have no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be placed at the foot of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND IN OKLAHOMA TO THE CITY OF WOODWARD, OKLA.

The bill (S. 998) to authorize the conveyance of a certain tract of land in the State of Oklahoma to the city of Woodward, Okla., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed to the city of Woodward, Okla., all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the following-described land situated in Woodward County, Okla.:

Beginning at a point 66.0 feet south and 283.0 feet west of the northeast corner of the northwest quarter of section 35, township 23 north, range 21 west, Indian meridian, and running thence south 273.0 feet, thence west 150.0 feet, thence north 273.0 feet, thence east 150.0 feet to the point of beginning, all lying in the northwest quarter of section 35, township 23 north, range

21 west, Indian meridian, and including an area of 0.940 acre more or less.

SEC. 2. The conveyance authorized by this act shall be made subject to (a) the condition that the city of Woodward, Okla., pay into the Treasury of the United States, in return for the land conveyed, an amount equal to 50 percent of the fair market value of such land to be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture after appraisal of such land, and (b) such other conditions, limitations, or reservations as the Secretary may deem necessary to protect the interests of the United States.

AMENDMENT OF RICE QUOTA MARKETING PROVISIONS

The bill (H. R. 2839) to amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RICE ALLOTMENT HISTORY

The bill (H. R. 4356) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, with respect to rice allotment history was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ACT OF 1936—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 153) to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 was announced as next in order.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

REPEAL OF SECTION 348 OF THE AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 1573) to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 was announced as next in order.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask that after the call of the calendar, H. R. 1573 be considered by the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Senator from South Carolina and several other Senators are very much interested in this proposed legislation, but we are not in position to debate it today. I gave Senators assurance that if it were objected to today on the call of the calendar it would be taken up at an early date.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, if it is to be passed, it will have to be passed within the next few days in order to relieve the situation of the farmers.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I assure the Senator from South Carolina that I shall be glad to talk to him about a convenient date when the measure can be considered by the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I thank the Senator from Texas.

OPERATION OF GOVERNMENT TIN SMELTERS AT TEXAS CITY, TEX.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 26) providing for the continued operation of the Government tin smelters at Texas City, Tex., was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring) That it is the sense of Congress that, pursuant to the provisions and authority of Public Law 125, 80th Congress, as amended, the Government tin smelter at Texas City, Tex., shall be continued in operation until June 30, 1956, and so long thereafter as may be hereafter authorized by the Congress.

SEC. 2. The President is hereby requested to have conducted a study and investigation for the purpose of recommending the most feasible methods of maintaining a permanent domestic tin-smelting industry in the United States; and, in connection with such study and investigation, the Federal Facilities Corporation, or any other designee of the President, is requested to show the plant and facilities to any interested persons and to provide them with all necessary and appropriate information within the limits of security considerations upon which to base appraisals and to formulate proposals to the Government for the future operation of the smelter by the Government or under private lease or ownership arrangements.

SEC. 3. The President is requested to report to the Congress prior to March 31, 1956, the findings of this study and his recommendations with respect to the future operation of the tin smelter.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD a brief statement prepared by me concerning Senate Concurrent Resolution 26.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF TEXAS

I strongly urge passage of Senate Concurrent Resolution 26.

This resolution proposes to continue operation of the Government tin smelter at Texas City, Tex., until June 30, 1956, and thereafter as authorized by Congress.

The resolution also requests the executive branch to conduct a study in order to be prepared to present to the Congress recommendations regarding the most feasible methods of maintaining a permanent domestic tin-smelting industry in the United States—whether under Government ownership or private ownership.

Unless this resolution is enacted, operation of the tin smelter will end on June 30 of this year. This, I am convinced, would be contrary to our national interests.

The United States is in this position: It is the largest single consumer of tin in the world; it must depend on foreign sources for virtually its entire supply of tin.

There is only one tin smelter in the Western Hemisphere—that in Texas. There is only one principal source of tin ore in the Western Hemisphere—Bolivia.

These two facts are of great significance, taken in conjunction with each other.

For the sake of our national security; as an aid to maintaining the free economy of the nation of Bolivia; and to lessen the risk of our being subjected to price gouging by those controlling foreign tin supplies, continued operation of the North American tin smelter using South American tin ore is essential.

I urge that the Senate adopt the resolution approved by the Committees on Armed Services and Banking and Currency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the regular call of the calendar. The bill passed to the foot of the calendar will be stated.

EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE TO FARMERS AND STOCKMEN

The bill (S. 1372) to amend the act of April 6, 1949, to extend the period for emergency assistance to farmers and and stockmen was announced as next in order.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I have some remarks to make which are not related to the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Michigan if he will withhold his remarks. There are only two more bills remaining on the calendar.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I shall be happy to do so.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, with reference to Senate bill 1372 there is in course of preparation language which will permit of the imposition of a time limitation with reference to supplementary loans.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1372) to amend the act of April 6, 1949, to extend the period for emergency assistance to farmers and stockmen.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 10, it is proposed to strike out the first period and insert a comma, and the following: "but no such loans shall be made in any event after July 14, 1959."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 (c) of the act of April 6, 1949, as amended, is further amended by striking the word "two" from the first sentence of said subsection and inserting the word "four" and by adding after the first sentence of the said subsection the following new sentence: "After the expiration of the period specified herein, such loans may be made only for supplementary advances to producers indebted for loans made under this subsection, but no such loans shall be made in any event after July 14, 1959."

RELIEF FOR FARMERS AND FARM WORKERS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of order No. 210, Senate bill 1628, to provide relief for farmers and farm workers suffering crop losses or loss of employment because of damage to crops caused by drought, flood, hail, frost, freeze, wind, insect infestation, plant disease, or other natural causes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1628)

which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with amendments.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I understand the committee amendments have been agreed to. The bill vests the Secretary of Agriculture with power to proceed in cases of disaster such as are outlined in the bill. There is nothing compulsory on the Secretary. Being wholly a discretionary measure, I hope there will be no objection to it.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, this bill would provide relief to producers in areas suffering natural disasters by permitting the Secretary of Agriculture to allot them additional acreage for the production of commodities subject to production controls. The disaster which gave rise to this bill was the freeze which occurred in many States in late March. Producers, farm workers, and others in these areas will suffer severe hardship if substitute crops cannot be planted. In many cases the planting of substitute crops is prevented by acreage allotments, and this bill would provide a measure of relief in those cases.

The committee amendments, first, make it entirely discretionary with the Secretary as to the amount of relief, if any, to be accorded to any and all producers; and, second, strike out a provision requiring additional allotments to provide all farmers with a livelihood.

The additional acreage allotted under the bill for any crop for any year would be limited to the smaller of first, 500,000 acres or second, 3 percent of the national allotment for such crop.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. May I ask the Senator from South Carolina if the bill as reported from the committee is agreeable to him.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. All of the amendments have been adopted, and the matter is left discretionary with the Secretary.

Mr. AIKEN. It is discretionary, not mandatory. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1628) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.,—

CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS

SECTION 1. The Congress hereby finds (1) that crop losses due to drought, flood, hail, frost, freeze, wind, insect infestation, plant disease, or other natural causes result in severe hardship, suffering, and economic loss, not only in the case of operators of farms but in the case of their tenants and employees as well; (2) that, by reason of acreage limitations or other production controls, farmers suffering such losses are often prevented from planting other crops to replace those lost or damaged; (3) that as a result thereof agricultural workers and other persons dependent on such crops for a livelihood are forced to seek other employment thus caus-

ing dislocation of populations and other trends which tend to unbalance existing ratios between rural and urban populations; (4) that the economies of the areas affected are thereby disrupted and the economy of the entire Nation adversely affected.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSES

SEC. 2. It is the purpose of this act to alleviate hardship, suffering, and economic losses resulting from disastrous loss or damage to agricultural crops due to natural causes, and to prevent serious dislocation of populations, and other adverse effects on the economies of the areas affected and the Nation, by making possible the planting of additional acreage of other crops which will in part replace those destroyed or damaged and thus provide a livelihood for farm operators and workers who would otherwise be forced to seek other means of support for themselves and their families.

INCREASE IN ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

SEC. 3. (a) Whenever the Secretary of Agriculture determines—

(1) that in any area any agricultural crop which is important to the economy of such area has been destroyed or severely damaged by drought, flood, hail, frost, freeze, wind, insect infestation, plant disease, or other natural cause; and

(2) that, except for acreage limitations or other production controls, other crops could be planted to replace or supplement the crop destroyed, or damaged, the Secretary, upon application by the operator of any farm within such area, may cause to be allotted to such farm additional acreage for the planting of any such crop in such amount as the Secretary determines to be advisable to carry out the purposes of this act.

(b) The aggregate of the additional acreage allotted for any crop year under this section for the planting of any agricultural commodity shall not exceed (1) 500,000 acres, or (2) 3 percent of the national acreage allotment for such commodity for such year, whichever is smaller.

ADDITIONAL ACREAGE NOT TO BE CONSIDERED FOR PURPOSE OF FUTURE ALLOTMENTS

SEC. 4. The additional acreage authorized to be allotted to farms under this act for any year shall be in addition to the county, State, and national acreage allotments for such year. Such additional acreage shall not be taken into account in establishing future State, county, and farm acreage allotments.

DEFINITION OF AGRICULTURAL CROP

SEC. 5. As used in this act, the term "agricultural crop" means any crop of a product of the soil, including horticultural crops.

TERMINATION DATE

SEC. 6. This act shall cease to be in effect on June 1, 1958.

Mr. WILLIAMS subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier today the Senate passed Senate bill 1628, Calendar No. 210, a bill to provide relief of farmers and farmworkers suffering crop losses or loss of employment because of damage to crops caused by drought, flood, hail, frost, freeze, wind, insect infestation, plant disease, or other natural causes. I had filed an objection to the bill, but it was inadvertently overlooked. Therefore, Mr. President, at this time I enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which Senate bill 1628 was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to reconsider will be entered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I do not know that the objection of the Senator from Delaware to the bill was overlooked, because the able members of the minority calendar committee objected to consideration of the bill when it was called on the calendar. However, at the conclusion of the calendar call, the majority leader asked that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1628, Calendar No. 210; and it was under that procedure that the bill was passed.

Of course, the Senator from Delaware is perfectly within his rights in submitting the motion to reconsider; but the majority leader hopes that at the conclusion of action tomorrow on the agricultural appropriation bill, it will be agreeable to the authors of Senate bill 1628 and to the distinguished Senator from Delaware to have the Senate proceed to act on his motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed. If that is agreeable, I should like to have the RECORD so show at this time, so that Members may be on notice that this question is likely to come up then.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is agreeable to me, and I wish to have this understanding, because I understand there is a possibility that the Finance Committee will be in session tomorrow afternoon, in which event, before my motion is taken up, I would wish to be notified. I shall be in the city. If we can be notified in advance, I shall be glad to cooperate with the Senator from Texas in having the motion brought up.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Then let the Senate be on notice, first, that the Senator from Texas assumes the responsibility of notifying the Senator from Delaware that consideration of the agricultural appropriation bill will be followed by consideration of his motion to reconsider the vote by which Senate bill 1628 was passed. We hope his motion will be taken up by the Senate late tomorrow afternoon or else on Wednesday, depending on the time the Senate consumes in acting on the agricultural appropriation bill.

If the majority leader had known earlier today that the Senator from Delaware wished to be notified when the Senate proceeded to consider Senate bill 1628, the majority leader would certainly have notified him. But the Senator from Texas knows that the Senator from Delaware does not contend that Senators on this side of the aisle failed to carry out any such agreement.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; but I did not understand that the bill was to be considered today.

Except for any other understanding the majority leader may have, I would be willing to have my motion considered this afternoon. But in view of the understanding which has been had, I am willing to have my motion go over until tomorrow, although I do not wish to agree that consideration of the motion will follow the Senate's action tomorrow on the agricultural appropriation bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Delaware may be assured that the Senator from Texas will personally notify him before a motion to take up his motion for reconsideration is made.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And I will notify the Senator from Texas, too.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I wish to say that when Senate bill 1628 was passed over, during the call of the calendar, as acting majority leader I discussed the bill with both Senators on the minority calendar committee, who approved having the bill brought up later, following the calendar call; and I also discussed the bill with the ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I understood from them that there was no objection to the bill, with the amendments which are now in it. That is the reason I did not object when the majority leader asked for the consideration of the bill following the call of the calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I thoroughly understand the position of the Senator from Delaware. I think it is a position which was apparently not known to any Member of the Senate when the bill was being considered.

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry [Mr. ELLENDER] stated to the majority leader that the bill had been reported unanimously. The minority calendar committee objected to the consideration and passage of the bill on the call of the calendar. The Senate then proceeded to consider it after the call of the calendar had been concluded. Several Senators spoke on the bill. Every Senator had an opportunity to speak. The distinguished Senator from Delaware was occupied in a very important meeting of the Finance Committee and was not aware that the bill was being considered at that time. He is perfectly within his rights to move to reconsider.

All the majority leader wishes to do is to serve notice on the Senator from Delaware and other Members of the Senate that as soon as the unfinished business, namely, the agricultural appropriations bill, is disposed of, it is proposed to proceed to the consideration of the motion of the Senator from Delaware. The Senator from Texas will assume the responsibility of personally notifying the Senator from Delaware when that is done.

BILL PASSED OVER

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, is the Senate now to consider Calendar 211, Senate bill 1079, to provide for the sale of certain lands in the national forests?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That bill has been passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That bill has gone over to the next call of the calendar.

AMENDMENT OF RICE MARKETING QUOTA PROVISIONS OF THE AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938, AS AMENDED

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to consider Order 213, H. R. 4647, to amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4647) which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with amendments on page 1, line 8, to strike out "five per centum" and insert "2 per centum or by such greater acreage as may be necessary to provide such State with an allotment equal to its 1950 allotment," and in line 11, after the word "for," to strike out "1955" and insert "1955 (i)."

On page 2, line 4, after the word "acreage", to insert a comma and "and (ii) the 1955 allotment for any county in which the 1950-1954 average planted plus diverted acreage of rice, adjusted for trends in acreage, exceeds the 1945-1949 average planted acreage of rice, similarly adjusted, by more than 2 per centum shall be further increased by such additional acreage as may be necessary to provide such county with an allotment equal to its 1950 allotment."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a brief explanation of the bill.

There being no objection, the explanation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPLANATION OF H. R. 4647

This bill, with the committee amendments, would make several increases in 1955 rice-acreage allotments. First, it would increase each State allotment by 2 percent. Second, it would provide each State, and each of those counties whose base acreage had risen 2 percent since 1950, with a minimum 1955 allotment, equal to its 1950 allotment. Third, it would increase each State reserve for new producers and new farms to a minimum of 500 acres.

The purpose of the bill is to relieve hardship resulting from the sharp reduction in rice acreage required by the 1955 allotment. In an effort to take care of the various hardships which have arisen in the various rice-growing areas the committee has proposed amendments which incorporate the substance of Senate bills 1061 and 882, which provide respectively for the State and county minimum allotments just described. As shown in the committee report the areas which would benefit from these minimum provisions have increased their acreage devoted to rice production since the base period applicable to 1950, but now would receive sharp cuts below their 1950 allotments

because of the expansion of rice production in other areas.

In order to avoid unduly increasing the national rice acreage the committee amendments would also reduce to 2 percent the 5 percent general increase in State allotments provided by the bill as it passed the House.

The provision for increasing the State reserve is of particular significance in South Carolina where the two price producers have established a rice mill. These producers have previous production history in Georgia and Texas but not in South Carolina. Unless they can obtain a reasonable 1955 allotment on a new farm basis they may be forced to move their rice mill to Texas. This would cause difficulties for all rice producers served by the mill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL subsequently said:

Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana who is chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, a question. Were the amendments to H. R. 4647, Calendar No. 213, unanimously agreed to by the committee; and was the bill with the amendments as reported by the committee the bill which was passed today?

Mr. ELLENDER. The answer to the Senator's question is in the affirmative.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Then, as I understand, the amendments were unanimously agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. There was no opposition to this bill being reported.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Louisiana.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is the unfinished business now the agricultural appropriation bill, Calendar No. 220, House bill 5239?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That bill has been made the unfinished business.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota will state it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. What happened to Calendar No. 216, H. R. 4356; Calendar No. 217, S. 153; Calendar No. 218, H. R. 1573; and Calendar No. 219, Senate Concurrent Resolution 26?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. By unanimous consent, the bills which have just been passed were called up after having been placed at the foot of the calendar. The minority calendar committee had asked that they go to the foot of the calendar until amendments could be drafted.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I was detained in the Committee on Foreign Relations and was not aware of the progress which had been made with the call of the calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Calendar No. 217, S. 153, and Calendar No. 218, H. R. 1573, were called but were passed over. Senate Concurrent Resolution 26 was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Were S. 153 and H. R. 1573 placed at the foot of the calendar or were they objected to?

Mr. ELLENDER. They were objected to.

Mr. STENNIS. Since the Senator from Minnesota was not present when those bills were called, I may state that I was the Senator who, through the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], interposed objection to Calendar No. 217, S. 153, a bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936. I shall be glad to discuss that bill with the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to advise the Senator from Minnesota that Calendar No. 216, H. R. 4356, to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, with respect to rice allotment history, was passed, and Calendar No. 219, Senate Concurrent Resolution 26, providing for the continued operation of the Government tin smelters at Texas City, Tex., was agreed to.

Calendar No. 217, S. 153, to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, and Calendar No. 218, H. R. 1573, to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, were passed over to the next call of the calendar.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Chair.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I desire to advise the Senator from Minnesota that I interposed objection to the passage of Calendar No. 218, H. R. 1573, but that I expect the bill to be considered by the Senate at an early date. The Senate may wish to consider it at this time, but I have objected to its passage on the call of the calendar.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I express the hope that before the end of the day, I may be able to have a personal conference with my good friend, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] in reference to Calendar No. 217, S. 153 and with my good friend, the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] on Calendar No. 218, H. R. 1573, to see if action cannot be taken on those bills.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I dislike to dash the hopes of such a young and good-looking man as the distinguished Senator from Minnesota—

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. But so far I am concerned, I am not prepared to discuss H. R. 1573 today.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Then it may be necessary to return to a consideration of S. 153, Calendar No. 217.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, has the call of the calendar been completed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The call of the calendar has been completed.

The unfinished business is Calendar No. 220, H. R. 5239, making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

SALE OF CERTAIN LANDS IN THE NATIONAL FORESTS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, before Senators begin to make speeches, I understand that the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] desires to return to the consideration of Calendar No. 211, S. 1079, to provide for the sale of certain lands in the national forests.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I have been speaking with the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] who had a very legitimate objection to the passage of the bill on the consent calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. May I ask the Senator from Vermont if my understanding is correct that he is referring to Calendar No. 211, S. 1079?

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is correct. I wish to explain that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry acted rather hurriedly on the bill and took more out of it than it should have. It is my purpose to restore certain language that should be contained in the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to the consideration of Calendar 211, S. 1079, to provide for the sale of certain lands in the national forests.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1079) to provide for the sale of certain lands in the national forests.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator from Vermont that, if he will offer his amendment, the Senate can now take action on it.

Mr. AIKEN. I have an amendment prepared by the committee counsel. The committee amendment struck out, on line 7, after the word "strip", the following: "or (2) lands immediately adjacent to urban areas, when he finds such lands suitable for private ownership and better adapted to commercial, agricultural, residential, or other private purposes than to national forest purposes."

The last three lines of the bill should remain as they were originally printed. The Secretary of Agriculture would thus be required to make a finding that such lands were suitable for private ownership. The last three lines read: "when he finds such lands suitable for private ownership and better adapted to commercial, agricultural, residential, or other private purposes than to national forest purposes."

The bill is intended to apply only to little strips of land isolated from the national forests and which, in effect, are a nuisance to administer. The bill would direct the Secretary of Agriculture to dispose of such land.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 6, it is proposed to strike out "(1)."

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued April 27, 1955
For actions of April 26, 1955
84th-1st, No. 68

CONTENTS

Accounting.....21	Fertilizers.....15	Reclamation.....7,12,17,22
ACP.....1	Forestry.....4,16,25	Prices, support.....1
Acreage allotments.....2,10	Fruits and vegetables...1	Research.....1,15
Adjournment.....9	Home economics.....1	Rice.....10
Agricultural appropriations.....1	Insect control.....1	Statehood.....13
Appropriations.....1	Lands.....7,22	Sugar.....5
Budget.....20	public.....12	Surplus commodities....12,30
Conservation.....16	Loans, farm.....1,11,28	Territories and possessions.....12,13
Crop insurance.....24	Marketing.....19	Trade agreements.....6
Dairy industry.....19	Monopolies.....14	Travel.....8
Disaster relief.....2	Natural resources.....25	TVA.....15
Education.....27	Organization, exec...3,20	Veterans' benefits.....11
Electrification.1,15,18,23	Penalty mail.....29	Wheat.....1
	Personnel.....8,26	

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate passed USDA appropriation bill. Upon reconsideration, Senate again passed bill authorizing additional acreage allotments for freeze areas, etc. Senate committee voted to report trade agreements bill. Senate committee voted to report bill to increase travel allowances. House committee ordered reported bill for Federal cooperation in non-Federal reclamation projects. Rep. Hagen objected to request that House concur in Senate amendments on bill to increase rice allotments. Sen. Wiley introduced and discussed bill to remove milk trade barriers. Sen. McClellan introduced and discussed bill to establish joint budget committee.

SENATE

1. AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1956. Passed with amendments this bill, H. R. 5329 (pp. 4324-43). Sens. Russell, Hayden, Hill, Robertson, Ellender, Young, McCarthy, and Mundt were appointed Senate conferees (p. 4343). Agreed to all committee amendments, except that the item on research was further amended, by an amendment offered by Sen. Stennis, to provide \$40,000 additional with the intention that it be used for home economics work (pp. 4326-33). Sen. Stennis recommended that the Department establish an advisory committee on home economics research (p. 4331). Rejected, 76-5, an amendment by Sen. Williams to decrease the advance ACP authorization from \$250,000,000 to \$175,000,000 for 1956 (pp. 4333-7, 4340-1). Sen. Mansfield recommended additional funds for ARS for the Milk River mosquito-control program in Mont. (pp. 4338-40). Sen. Humphrey criticized the increase in interest rate on emergency loans (p. 4335). Sens. Young and Williams debated wheat price supports (pp. 4336, 4340-1). Sens. Douglas, Russell, and others discussed the bill to repeal the REA State formula and the possibility of additional REA funds if this bill is not enacted (pp. 4342-3). Sen. Robertson inserted a letter from the Appalachian Apple Service requesting discontinuance of USDA apple-price predictions (p. 4343). Sen. Payne suggested that the Department enlist State support of the gypsy moth control program (pp. 4324-6).

2. ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS. Upon reconsideration (requested by Sen. Williams), again

passed as reported S. 1628, to authorize additional acreage allotments for farmers whose crops are destroyed or damaged by freeze, hail, etc. (pp. 4343-7).

3. REORGANIZATION. Passed without amendment S. 1763, to extend the termination date of the Hoover Commission through June 30, 1955 (pp. 4337-8).
4. FORESTRY. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee voted to report without amendment S. 52, to amend the act to protect scenic values in the Coconino National Forest, Ariz. (p. D334).
5. SUGAR. Sen. Magnuson submitted amendments which he intends to propose to S. 1635, to extend the Sugar Act of 1948 and increase the mainland quotas (p. 4312).
6. TRADE AGREEMENTS. The Finance Committee ordered favorably reported with amendments H. R. 1, to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements. The "Daily Digest" states that the following major amendments were adopted: As a substitute for all amendments relating to commodities, an amendment authorizing the President to take such action as he deems necessary to adjust imports of any article, if such article is being imported in such quantities as to threaten the national security; and an amendment to strengthen the escape-clause provisions of the law. (p. D334.)
7. RECLAMATION; LANDS. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee ordered favorably reported with amendments S. 300, authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colo. (major amendment would reduce repayment provisions from 70 to 60 years due to downward revision in estimated construction costs); S. 265, to amend acts authorizing agricultural entries under nonmineral land laws of certain mineral lands so as to increase limitation on desert entries made under such acts to 320 acres; and without amendment S. 748, to prohibit the U. S. from acquiring mineral interests in lands acquired by it except when necessary to serve the purpose for which such lands are acquired (p. D334).
8. TRAVEL. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee ordered favorably reported without amendment S. 1580, to increase the maximum per diem and subsistence allowance of Federal employees from \$9 to \$13 per day, and the maximum auto allowance from 7 to 10 cents per mile (p. D335).
9. RECESSED until Thurs., Apr. 28 (p. 4349).

HOUSE

10. RICE ALLOTMENTS. Rep. Hagen objected to a motion to concur in Senate amendments to H. R. 4647, to increase rice acreage allotments, and stated that the bill as passed by the Senate makes special provision for one and possibly two States, at the disadvantage of the rest of the rice-growing States (pp. 4371-2).
11. FARM LOANS. The Veterans' Affairs Committee reported without amendment H. R. 5715, to extend the authority of the Veterans' Administration to continue through June 30, 1956, to make direct loans to veterans, and to authorize \$150,000,000 therefor (H. Rept. 1447) (p. 4374). The Committee was authorized to file the report by midnight, Apr. 26 (p. 4370).

very good politics. Generally it goes better with the folks back home, at least at election time, to profess ignorance of politics and at the same time to modestly let it be understood, even if you have to leak the news yourself by inference, that on all other subjects you just happen to be well informed. I hasten to explain this statement is not intended to impugn the motives of any Member of Congress other than my own.

What, Mr. Speaker, would the good people of the First District of the State of Washington, who not only elected me once but returned me to Congress, think of their Representative if he confessed ignorance, or what may be just as bad, if he admitted confusion on a simple subject like geography? However, it looks as though that is the situation.

What may make matters even worse, out in the State of Washington we have always had a fine public-school system. When I was a boy in the fifth or sixth grade I had the advantage of a fine course in elementary geography. Now it seems what I was taught was wrong. Columbus was wrong. We have been under a delusion—the world is not round.

It seems hard to believe, Mr. Speaker, that my teachers in the Summit School in Seattle would have misled me on that one point. They were right about other matters. Not even the Socialists nor reactionaries; nor a depression nor prosperity; nor peace nor war; nor anything since has changed the arithmetic of simple economics taught me in my youth. Two plus two is still four. Reading, writing, and arithmetic are the same. So is the history of this great land of freedom and opportunity; it has not changed. But with geography it may be different.

I say this because I distinctly remember my teachers explaining the shape of the earth so that in circumnavigating the surface of the world the farther one traveled north, for example, from the equator, the less the distance between two locations. Thus a ship from Seattle to the Orient making a circular swing northward, taking advantage of the shorter distance, saved about 1,200 miles as against a ship sailing from San Francisco. In terms of time this was a saving of about 48 hours, or in today's values, figuring present operating costs of modern ships, a huge saving in running a ship.

Now, Mr. Speaker, imagine my disillusionment; for it turns out that all these years I have been in error. Only yesterday I was informed by a high official in the Pentagon that the Army operates on a formula that it is 350 miles shorter in winter and 200 miles shorter in summer from San Francisco than from Seattle to Japan. This was a severe shock and the extent of the seasonal variation was, too. I know about expansion and contraction under heat and cold, but the page in my geography book must have been missing on this earthly phenomenon.

The operators of private ships use the northern route winter and summer crossing the Pacific Ocean, and according to their old-fashioned chronometers and calendars this reduces the trip by a

couple of days. But not the Military Sea Transportation Service, which appears to follow the modern army system of measuring distance, and possibly, too, may follow a fairly recent California Chamber of Commerce shipping bulletin which authoritatively says the northern route from Seattle is unusable 95 percent of the time. We have all heard that the world is getting smaller; what some of us did not know was that the world, unlike people who get older, is shrinking at the girth and not at the neck. Not too seriously speaking, Mr. Speaker, I should have been given sixth-grade geopolitics—not geography. You can see that is about the size of it. Because if I was a member of the House Committee on Armed Services, maybe I could have asked Army witnesses a few questions about geography and learned the new system.

The great State of California is fortunate. It has four distinguished Representatives—more members than any other State—on the House Armed Services Committee. They are fine gentlemen and certainly not ignorant, like the gentleman from Washington who still clings to the old-fashioned notion that a GI by air or by sea can get home from the Orient quicker to his loved ones by the northern route.

It is not often that we find the branches of our military service in agreement, but as to the modern science of geography of the Pacific there would seem to be no clash of opinion. It is true that on the east coast the Navy maintains various operational bases besides Norfolk for combat ships. There are so-called home ports from north to south for various types of ships at Boston, Newport, New London, Charleston, and Key West. On the west coast the only such bases are at Long Beach and San Diego. This traditional concentration near the morale building and excellent year-round golf facilities of southern California, I assume, is owing to its location, to its strategic proximity to what I am discovering should be called the nearer to California Far East. While my maps are not up to date and fail to show this, it may be that the Pacific Northwest and Alaska are so remote from Asia they are quite safe and do not need protection.

A while back I seem to recall the military decided we did not need an airlift across the northern route. It was too expensive. The Post Office Department ought to catch up because it pays on a per-mile basis, and since it pays the private airline on the old measurement basis, the Army mail in increasing amounts is designated via Seattle, which by old-fashioned geography, and old-fashioned economics, too, saves the Post Office Department a lot of money.

Of course, money, particularly other people's, is not everything.

That was demonstrated yesterday when the Pentagon announced Operation Gyroscope. This is a rotation movement of troops. The 187th Airborne Regimental Combat Team will come back and the 508th will replace it on the island of Kyushu, Japan. C-124 Globemaster troop carriers will make

this 12,000-mile round-trip airlift across the Pacific.

This will be an interesting experiment in overseas troop movement, but it will be of particular interest to me to find out from the final study and evaluation, first, why this operation is not planned via the North Pacific; and, second, how much differential in cost, in extra gasoline alone, would the operation entail as between San Francisco and Seattle.

As I say, my old-fashioned geography must be all wrong. Perhaps Operation Gyroscope will straighten out my thinking. Then I can tell my constituents and taxpayers, and they will be happy that the armed services have been right all along—and sorry for me on account of the poor geography taught me in my youth. Maybe the world is not round.

RICE MARKETING QUOTAS

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4647) to amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "5 percent" and insert "2 percent or by such greater acreage as may be necessary to provide such State with an allotment equal to its 1950 allotment."

Page 1, line 9, strike out "1955" and insert "1955 (1)."

Page 2, line 3, after "acreage" insert ", and (ii) the 1955 allotment for any county in which the 1950-54 average planted plus diverted acreage of rice, adjusted for trends in acreage, exceeds the 1945-49 average planted acreage of rice, similarly adjusted, by more than 2 percent shall then be further increased by such additional acreage as may be necessary to provide such county with an allotment equal to its 1950 allotment."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I desire to ask the gentleman from Texas whether or not this bill is intended to give and does give the State of Oklahoma a reserve acreage of not less than 500 acres for apportionment to farms operated by persons who have not produced rice during the preceding 5 years or on which rice or farms on which rice has not been planted in the preceding 5 years.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. The gentleman's question is whether that protects Oklahoma?

Mr. ALBERT. The question is whether this bill gives not less than 500 acres to the State of Oklahoma.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. That is correct. That is correct in my understanding. That was the understanding of our committee when we held the hearings on it and when we reported the bill out.

Mr. ALBERT. And that is the gentleman's understanding of the language in the bill?

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. That is my understanding. It is the language of the bill.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. HAGEN. Reserving the right to object, as I understand it, the House version of this bill increased the acreage, which treated every State equally, with some minor exceptions with reference to North Carolina. That has been upset by the Senate, and they have written this language so that certain States will get an undue amount of this new acreage. Is that correct?

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. I would not say so. The language of the Senate version reestablishes the acreage as it was in 1950, or at least says that no State shall have less than that acreage. Frankly, that was a very moving factor when our committee was considering the original measure, as the gentleman will recall.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that this bill as passed by the Senate makes special provision for one and possibly two States, at the disadvantage of the rest of the rice-growing States. I do not want to be obnoxious in this matter, but I am constrained to object to these amendments, and I do object, Mr. Speaker.

PURPLE HEART STAMP

(Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, Boston is signally honored and privileged this year to be the convention city of the Military Order of the Purple Heart. The order has chosen Boston because it is one of the oldest and most historic cities of the Nation and will meet there on August 9 through 14 for its annual convention.

As a well-deserved tribute to this outstanding patriotic organization, I have today introduced in the House a bill providing for the issuance of a special commemorative postage stamp in honor of the Order of the Purple Heart with the added provision that the first-day sale be made at Boston the day before the 1955 convention opens.

A constituent of mine, Mr. Rosaire J. Rajotte, of Northbridge, Mass., legislative officer of the Department of Massachusetts, Military Order of the Purple Heart, has furnished me with background material concerning the establishment of the Purple Heart award.

The Badge of Military Merit, designed as the figure of a heart, in purple was created by George Washington and the first award was made on August 7, 1782. The following is the text of General Washington's order, which established this award:

UNITED STATES ARMY HEADQUARTERS,
Newburgh, N. Y., August 7, 1782.

Orders of the day:
For fatigue tomorrow, the Second Massachusetts Regiment.
Countersign:

YORK LANCASTER.

The general, ever desirous to cherish a virtuous ambition in his soldiers, as well as to foster and encourage every species of military merit, directs that whenever any singularly meritorious action is performed, the author of it shall be permitted to wear on his facings over the left breast, the figure of a heart in purple cloth or silk, edged with narrow lace or bindings. The road to glory in a patriot army and free country is thus open to all. This order is also to have retrospect to the earliest stages of the war, and to be considered a permanent one.

G. WASHINGTON,
Commander in Chief.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, was created an award which honored the heroes of the war for independence. It was in 1932 that attention was again focused on the Purple Heart when General Douglas MacArthur issued orders to reactivate this outstanding decoration for military achievement. This is the text of General MacArthur's order:

THE PURPLE HEART
GENERAL ORDERS NO. 3
WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, February 22, 1932.

Purple Heart: By order of the President of the United States, the Purple Heart, established by Gen. George Washington at Newburgh, N. Y., August 7, 1782, during the War of Revolution, is hereby revived out of respect of his memory and military achievements.

By order of the Secretary of War:
DOUGLAS MACARTHUR,
General, Chief of Staff.

While the Post Office Department was not too encouraging when I first took up this proposal, I hope that the stamp in honor of the Military Order of the Purple Heart can be included in the 1955 series of special commemorative stamps. Such a stamp will be a deserving tribute to this organization and the wounded of World War II and the Korean war.

The text of my bill follows:

A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp to commemorate the Military Order of the Purple Heart

Be it enacted, etc., That the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to issue a special postage stamp to commemorate the Military Order of the Purple Heart, an award first made by George Washington on August 7, 1782. Such special postage stamp shall be issued in such denomination and design, and for such period beginning August 9, 1955, as the Postmaster General may determine, and shall be placed on sale in Boston, Mass., site of the 1955 annual convention of the Military Order of the Purple Heart, 1 day before it is made available to the public elsewhere.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. BARTLETT and to include an editorial.

Mr. FLOOD (at the request of Mr. QUIGLEY) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. QUIGLEY in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOGGS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ALEXANDER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SIEMINSKI in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RADWAN.

Mr. BETTS and to include an editorial appearing in the Marion Star.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE and to include a letter and an editorial.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GUBSER (at the request of Mr. YOUNGER) in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania and to include an editorial.

Mr. PATTERSON and to include an article.

Mr. DONDERO and to include an address.

Mr. JUDD in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JOHNSON of California in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BURDICK (at the request of Mr. MORANO).

Mr. KEATING in five instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. KEATING) in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. WILSON of California and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SCHWENGEL and include an editorial.

Mr. HILL, notwithstanding it will exceed two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$180.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania and include three editorials, As the Delaware River Goes, So Go the Nation's Waterways.

Mr. DOYLE and include appropriate material.

Mr. MADDEN and include a resolution.

Mr. EDMONDSON (at the request of Mr. ALBERT).

Mr. CELLER.

SENATE BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 26. An act for the relief of Donald Hector Taylor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 29. An act for the relief of Rica, Lucy, and Salomon Breger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 36. An act for the relief of Lupe M. Gonzalez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 42. An act for the relief of Selma Rivlin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 68. An act for the relief of Evantiyi Yorgiadis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 71. An act for the relief of Ursula Else Boysen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 89. An act for the relief of Margaret Isabel Byers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued April 28, 1955
For actions of April 27, 1955
84th-1st, No. 69

CONTENTS

Acreage allotments.....3	Lands, public.....14	Rice.....3,20
Agricultural	transfer.....6	Roads.....25
appropriations.....27	Loans, farm.....23	Statehood.....7
Appropriations.....1,26,27	Low-income farmers.....1	Sugar.....18
Cotton.....5	Marketing.....8	Surplus commodities.....20
Dairy industry.....19	Personnel.....13,24	Territories and
Electrification.....10,21	Prices.....4,19	possessions.....7,8
Employment.....12	support.....2,5,17	War-risk insurance.....9
Forestry.....16	Public works.....12	Water pollution.....15
Fruits and vegetables.....4	Reclamation.....11,22	

HIGHLIGHTS; House received President's message on low-income farmers, and Reps. Hope and Siler commended it. House concurred in Senate amendments on bill to increase rice allotments. House Rules Committee cleared price-support bill; not to be debated this week. House subcommittee ordered reported bill to prohibit USDA apple-price predictions. Rep. Rhodes, Ariz., urged cotton program revision. Rep. Teague urged increase in domestic sugar quotas. Rep. Gathings commended Department's program for disposition of surplus rice. Rep. Engle introduced bill for Federal cooperation in non-Federal reclamation projects.

HOUSE

1. LOW-INCOME FARMERS. Received the President's message recommending a 15-point program to aid low-income farmers, transmitting a USDA report, "Development of Agriculture's Human Resources, a Report on Problems of Low-Income Farmers," and stating that proposals will be presented to Congress shortly for enabling legislation and necessary appropriations (H. Doc. 149); to Agriculture Committee (p. 4379). Reps. Hope and Siler commended the President, the Secretary and those who helped in the preparation of this report (pp. 4386-7).
2. PRICE SUPPORTS. The Rules Committee granted an open rule providing for 4 hours of general debate on H. R. 12, the 90-percent price support bill (p. D345). The "Daily Digest" states that action on this bill "would not be sought this week" (p. D343).
3. RICE ALLOTMENTS. House concurred in Senate amendments to H. R. 4647, to increase rice acreage allotments (pp. 4377-9). This bill will now be sent to the President. (For provisions of this bill as passed see Digest #67).
4. APPLE PRICES. The McMillan subcommittee, Agriculture Committee, ordered reported H. R. 5188, to prohibit the publication by the Government of any predictions with respect to apple prices (p. D344).

5. COTTON. Rep. Rhodes, Ariz., urged revision of the cotton program with respect to price supports, quality, and expanded markets at home and abroad (pp. 4405-6).
6. LAND TRANSFER. The McMillan subcommittee, Agriculture Committee, ordered reported H. R. 1762, directing the Department to sell a tract of ARS land to Woodward, Okla. (pp. D343-4).
7. STATEHOOD. The Rules Committee reported a resolution providing for the consideration of, 7 hours of debate on, and the limiting of amendments to, H. R. 2535, the Alaska-Hawaii statehood bill (p. 4407).
8. MARKETING; HAWAII. Received an Hawaii Legislature memorial requesting that Congress appropriate moneys for market-reporting and crop-estimating work in Hawaii (p. 4408).

SENATE

9. WAR-RISK INSURANCE. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee ordered reported with an amendment S. 741, to amend title XII of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to war risk insurance, in order to repeal the provision which would terminate authority to provide insurance under such title (p. D342).

BILLS INTRODUCED

10. ELECTRIFICATION. H. R. 5878, by Rep. Davidson, to authorize the construction of certain works of improvement in the Niagara River for power and other purposes; to Public Works Committee (p. 4407). Remarks of author (p. 4380).
11. RECLAMATION. H. R. 5881, by Rep. Engle, to supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee (p. 4407).
12. PUBLIC WORKS. H. R. 5885, by Rep. Jennings, to offset declining employment by providing for Federal assistance to States and local governments in projects of construction, alteration, expansion, or repair of public facilities and improvements; to Public Works Committee (p. 4407). Remarks of author (pp. 4397-8).
13. PERSONNEL. H. R. 5887, by Rep. Kelly, N. Y., to provide in certain cases that a person holding a position subject to the Classification Act of 1949 who is placed in a lower grade shall not receive less pay as a result thereof; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee (p. 4407).
H. R. 5899, by Rep. Davis, Ga., H. R. 5900, by Rep. Moss, H. R. 5901, by Rep. Morrison, H. R. 5902, by Rep. Rhodes, Pa., H. R. 5903, by Rep. Lesinski, H. R. 5904, by Rep. Pfoest, H. R. 5905, by Rep. Fascell, H. R. 5906, by Rep. Tumulty; to increase the rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee (p. 4407).
14. PUBLIC LANDS. H. R. 5891, by Rep. Rogers, Tex., to amend the act of July 31, 1947 and the mining laws to provide for multiple use of the surface of the same tracts of the public lands; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee (p. 4407).



United States
of America

Please return to
CHIEF, LEGISLATIVE REPORTING
Office of Budget and Finance

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 84th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 101

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 27, 1955

No. 69

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Thursday, April 28, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

House of Representatives

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 27, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Dr. Thorsten A. Gustafson, president, New York Conference, Augustana Lutheran Church, offered the following prayer:

God, our Father, Thou who hast welded us into a nation in dark and difficult days: We thank Thee for our country, filled with countless privileges, and imbued with the overwhelming trust of freedom. Given by Thee, power intended for the welfare of all mankind, our national leadership seeks Thy firm guidance along its way.

Thou who hast struggled in the valley of death for justice and peace: Increase our faith in the right and in the triumph of the good. When we complain, kindle anew in us our first love toward Thee. When we place great demands on others and small demands on ourselves, renew Thine image in us. Be Thou the constant help of all those who are deprived of their birthright, the homeless and the defenseless who are sacrificed to the results of misused power.

O Holy Spirit, Lord of Life: We would today take another step toward greatness in Thee. We would assume patiently the responsibility of the free citizen. Silence Thou our unbelief. Uphold us now in the anticipation of that day, when it shall be evident in all the world that Thou hast brought, in us and through us, truth and right to victory.

This we would ask in the name of Jesus Christ, our risen Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communi-

cated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on April 22, 1955, the President approved and signed a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4903. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5239. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. HILL, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. MCCARTHY, and Mr. MUNDT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1628. An act to provide relief to farmers and farmworkers suffering crop losses or loss of employment because of damage to crops caused by drought, flood, hail, frost, freeze, wind, insect infestation, plant disease, or other natural causes;

S. 1763. An act relating to the extension and the final liquidation of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; and

S. Con. Res. 18. Concurrent resolution favoring cooperation of the people in the fight for the prevention, treatment, and cure of mental illness.

AMENDING THE RICE-MARKETING-QUOTA PROVISIONS OF AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1938

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4647) to amend the rice-marketing-quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with Senate amendments, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "5 percent" and insert "2 percent or by such greater acreage as may be necessary to provide such State with an allotment equal to its 1950 allotment."

Page 1, line 9, strike out "1955" and insert "1955 (1)."

Page 2, line 3, after "acreage", insert ", and (ii) the 1955 allotment for any county in which the 1950-54 average planted plus diverted acreage of rice, adjusted for trends in acreage, exceeds the 1945-49 average planted acreage of rice, similarly adjusted, by more than 2 percent shall then be further increased by such additional acreage as may be necessary to provide such county with an allotment equal to its 1950 allotment."

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas some questions and make a statement.

The House passed the 5-percent increase with a special provision for South Carolina. What amount of acreage did that add to the national acreage?

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. I cannot answer the gentleman's question, but he was present and if he will refer to his record of the hearings I think he will find the answer.

Mr. HAGEN. Does the Senate version add less or more to the national acreage?

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. It would add less because of cuts from 5 to 2 percent.

Mr. HAGEN. It gives special relief to about 3 States?

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. That is correct; however, the overall acreage, if I am correctly informed from the other end of the Capitol, will be considerably less under the current bill.

Mr. HAGEN. The additional acreage given to 3 States is about 37,000 acres?

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. That is correct.

Mr. HAGEN. May I say that I have communicated, as a member of the Committee on Agriculture, with those Members from California who represent the principal rice-growing areas. They have, in turn, communicated with their growers. They do not like this unequal treatment. However, it is getting rather late in the season and the possibility is no increase will be adopted if this one is not agreed to. Although they do not like it, they are willing to go along. By reason of the emergency character of this legislation and the parliamentary situation, California Congressmen are placed in the position of either blocking unfair legislation, dictated by the other body, and foregoing some local benefit or acquiescing and accepting a basically unfair proposition as the price of securing some emergency acres and retaining the goodwill of the representatives of other rice areas. I have put this proposition to other California Congressmen who have checked with their constituents as I have said and in this one instance they are willing to yield. It is for this reason that I withdraw my objection raised yesterday but I would like to comment further on the questions raised by this development.

The question of raising the 1955 rice acreage allotment was presented to the House Agriculture Committee at an early date and the subcommittee of which I am a member worked assiduously on the problem. After extensive hearings it was determined that some emergency increase in acres was desirable provided all States were given equal treatment. Legislation embodying these principles was passed by the House at a very early date. Thereafter the other body dawdled with the subject and at a late date presents us with a basically different proposition which violates the rights of a great many rice-producing States.

This and similar occurrences are the reasons that I am voting against a restoration of 90 percent of parity on basic crops at this time. Unquestionably this high level of support has a greater tendency to produce surpluses and quotas than a lower level of support. It is my observation, based on sad recent experience, that it is almost a corollary proposition that with respect to any crop under quotas some Representative will conclude that his farmers are entitled to special treatment at the expense of farmers from other areas and he seeks such special treatment with frequent success. These actions make a political proposition out of support programs and justify much of the criticism of support programs which produce surpluses. Representatives of the areas of new, pro-

gressive production in the United States will not long tolerate any program which is twisted to the detriment of such production. No one wants to be the victim of a political gouge.

I believe in support programs for farmers. I believe that they are vitally necessary but at the moment I am withholding support for that kind of a support program which is most likely to produce those surpluses which necessitate the political gouge which I have seen applied around here of late.

It is of small value that the House acts equitably if the other body acts inequitably and imposes its will upon us. This rice legislation was passed with no debate in the Senate—with no voices of opposition.

Finally I would like to state that I am somewhat critical of my people with respect to this legislation. Although I am the only Californian on the Agriculture Committee I have received no communication from any farm organization or rice grower on this subject.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman from Texas whether or not he feels it would be well for this bill to go to conference or does he think it should be brought up here in this manner without due regard to the straight 5-percent increase which the House bill carried?

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. I am very strongly of the opinion that if we go to conference it will drag out so long it will be too late to plant rice.

Mr. GATHINGS. We do not have unanimity of agreement in the State of Arkansas by virtue of the amendment placed in the bill by the Senate. We like the House bill. Under the House version there was no special treatment accorded any one section of the belt; all were treated alike. Under this bill, in my State, we would get only about 9,000 additional acres. One county would pick up about 5,000 acres under the provision which was written into the legislation by the other body. May I ask the gentleman if he feels it would be better to pass this bill here today or go to conference?

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. I think it would be better to pass it right now; in other words, accept the Senate amendments.

Mr. GATHINGS. I withhold my objection for the sole reason that I am convinced that any further delay in the passage of a rice bill, even though the legislation provides only a mere pittance of relief, may mean that there will be no rice bill enacted which would add acreage for the 1955 crop year. This measure offers little, very little, assistance. It will, however, supplement the allotment of a host of rice farmers who are faced with glaring and brazen hardships. They need to have their allotments brought up to such a level as to be able to operate their farms on an economical basis. The cutbacks from their previous plantings are so severe that they amount to gross inequities which are unconscionable. Too, I am partly consoled in this matter by the fact that another bill, H. R. 2839, providing for the release and reapportion-

ment of unused rice acreages, has been adopted by the other body without amendment and is now before the President for his signature. I called the White House today to seek to determine when this bill might be signed, and while no action has been taken as yet, I am hopeful that we will receive speedy action. Thus, while the measure now before us provides a mere pittance, additional relief will be provided by the release and reapportionment legislation.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I am not objecting to the request to agree to the Senate amendments, because it appears evident that this is the best that we can obtain and objection now might prevent even this little relief being made available to those rice farmers in need of something being passed at this time to ease their situations. I much prefer, however, the language of the House bill and regret that we must accept less than that passed by the House. If we are to receive anything on this subject, it seems that this is the most we can pass.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I desire to ask the gentleman from Texas whether it is intended by this bill to give to Oklahoma and whether this bill in fact, gives to Oklahoma in 1955, a reserve acreage of not less than 500 acres for apportionment to farms in Oklahoma operated by persons who have not produced rice during the preceding 5 years or in which rice has not been planted in the preceding 5 years.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. I think it does, without any question. The problem of Oklahoma which the gentleman has just described is one of the reasons why section (4) beginning on page 2, line 18, was written into the original bill. Oklahoma was specifically mentioned in the House report. There is no doubt that the committee, and the House, intended to take care of the State of Oklahoma along with all other States with a like problem.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I might add that the increases in acreage in this entire bill are intended to take care of the 1955 emergency only, and should not be included in future history.

(Mr. SMITH of Mississippi asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, my initial impulse has been to object to the acceptance of the Senate amendments to this bill. The Senate amendments follow the procedure of giving special acreage consideration to old rice-growing areas where normal economic developments have resulted in a voluntary decrease in rice acreage.

This may be a humanitarian attitude to adopt in regard to modification of acreage bills, but the Congress has certainly refused to adopt such an attitude in consideration of other acreage legislation, notably that of cotton. The only legislation to increase cotton acreage which has been approved by the Congress has given special concessions to the new growing areas by contrast with

the old. When the House Agriculture Committee considered cotton acreage legislation a few months ago, some of the same members of the committee who approved of these Senate amendments actively opposed similar legislation for cotton. If the cotton legislation which the House passed was fair, this bill is decidedly unfair.

This bill will have the effect of increasing rice production at a time when the country is already burdened with a heavy surplus of rice. In view of objections which the Department of Agriculture, speaking for the President, has presented to other acreage increase legislation, the only consistent course that can be followed would be for the President to veto this bill.

I shall not object to this unanimous-consent request because it is possible that a bill to come out of conference might actually provide for an even greater increase in rice acreage. I want to call the attention of the Congress, however, to the inconsistency of the House Committee on Agriculture on the subject of rice and cotton acreage. I hope more fair treatment will be provided to both the cotton and rice growers in Mississippi in the future.

(Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

[Mr. HAGEN'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to object to passage of H. R. 4647, but I want to point out that as now before the House, it contains provisions I am reluctant to see enacted, and I want to make it clear that, so far as I am concerned, I hope this House will not consider this bill as establishing a precedent for future agricultural legislation.

This bill sets up emergency rice-acreage allotments of 1955. The planting season is now on us and if it is not immediately enacted it will do no good for anyone. That is one reason I am not objecting now. You will recall that this House passed a bill granting a 5-percent rice-acreage increase on an equal basis to all ricegrowing States. It treated all growers alike. When the measure reached the Senate it was amended and the measure now before us includes the Senate amendments to the House bill.

Now the bill provides for a 2-percent acreage increase, but provides for added acreage in certain States. While California will receive some benefit from this measure, it is reduced in comparison with that provided by the original bill passed by the House. At the same time, this measure now gives preferential treatment to certain other areas. I appreciate the difficulties faced by ricegrowers in certain areas and I want to be fair to them and to assist in solving their problems, but I feel that the principle of preferential treatment for certain States is a dangerous one and I am reluctant to see the Congress appear to embark on a program based upon regional or geographical considerations rather than a program designed to afford equal relief to all farmers who need it, regardless of where their farms are situated.

I sincerely hope this House will accept my view that in working out our farm problems we must act as a Nation on a national basis and not as individual States bickering over regional or local advantages.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEVELOPMENT OF AGRICULTURE'S HUMAN RESOURCES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 149)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In this wealthiest of nations where per capita income is the highest in the world, more than one-fourth of the families who live on American farms still have cash incomes of less than \$1,000 a year. They neither share fully in our economic and social progress nor contribute as much as they would like and can contribute to the Nation's production of goods and services.

This human problem is inadequately pictured by charts and figures. Curtailed opportunity begets an economic and social chain reaction which creates unjustified disparity in individual reward. Participation diminishes in community, religious, and civic affairs. Enterprise and hope give way to inertia and apathy. Through this process all of us suffer. This problem calls for understanding and for action.

We must open wider the doors of opportunity to our million and a half farm families with extremely low incomes—for their own well-being and for the good of our country and all our people.

Recommendations to achieve this end have been made to me by the Secretary of Agriculture. I transmit them to you, with my general approval, for your consideration.

The Secretary's recommendations for starting the program are based on the accompanying report prepared for him by the Department of Agriculture, entitled "Development of Agriculture's Human Resources, a Report on Problems of Low-Income Farmers." This report, more than a year in preparation, emphasizes the long-range nature of the low-income problem in agriculture and will serve to stimulate continuing study and action. Nevertheless, an immediate start is extremely important.

The essential cooperative nature of the undertaking is clear. The recommended program is cooperative as regards individual and group action, as regards private and public agencies, and as regards agencies at local, State, and Federal levels.

The Secretary's 15-point program recognizes that this is not exclusively an agricultural problem but that opportunities for off-farm employment are a part of the solution. Recommendations emphasize the voluntary approach, the importance of working with young people, and the desirability of broadening the program as experience is gained. In all matters, the urgency of the problem is recognized. The proposed program, however, is one of prudence as well as zeal.

A many-sided attack is essential. We need an integrated program in which each part contributes to the whole. Each will be more effective if the others are adopted. Together, they will help toward a solution within the framework of freedom for the individual, respect for his rights as an American citizen, and opportunity to participate more fully in the economic life of our Nation.

Proposals for enabling legislation and the necessary appropriations shortly will be presented to the Congress for consideration.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 26, 1955.

SEVENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE STATE OF ISRAEL

(Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to express my congratulations to the people of Israel today on the seventh anniversary of the founding of the state of Israel.

The creation and development of today's Israel were not easily attained. Her birth was the glorious culmination of strenuous and persistent efforts and the accomplishment of a noble, and sacred task, undertaken under most difficult conditions. Each of these years has been full of historic and momentous events accompanied by hardships and tremendous sacrifices.

Thus, today Israel is a living, growing entity in the Middle East. It is a truly democratic and progressive state with representative governmental institutions. The Israelis are renowned for the industry and ingenuity they have displayed in the building and in the improvement of their country. They have protected their newly won freedom in their ancient homeland with extraordinary vigilance and bravery. With enthusiasm and energy they are doing their utmost to convert the desert of the Negev into a fertile land, and the hills of Galilee into blossoming orchards. By the skillful use of science and the technical abilities of their people, by the erection of hydroelectric power stations, by installing water pipelines, and by the use of chemical fertilizers, the Israelis have turned arid and inhospitable hills and desert plains into cultivable and productive farm lands. In this respect, as in many others, they have worked near miracles.

Today on the celebration of her seventh anniversary Israel stands as a new and encouraging phenomenon in the

Middle East. One of her most pressing problems arises from the fact that her exports earn enough foreign exchange to pay for only a part of her imports. To make up the balance Israel is presently dependent upon foreign aid and such things as the sale of bonds.

The response of the Jewish people here in the United States to the financial needs of Israel has always won my deepest admiration. The sacrifices they make to assist their relatives and friends in Israel are often heroic.

As a member of the Foreign Aid Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations, I have in past years done everything possible to see that Israel was granted sufficient funds to progress with her noble task of creating a new life for the 750,000 refugees who have come to her shore since 1948.

I have derived great personal pleasure over the years in supporting legislation extending aid to the courageous people of this young nation, who despite many difficulties, economic and financial hardships, and political uncertainties, have made gigantic strides in attaining their goal of complete independence. The people of Israel face the future with confidence. I hope they continue in their task with undiminished zeal and boundless zest.

In the celebration of this anniversary I wish them peace, prosperity, and happiness, and express my hope that complete success will reward their valiant efforts in their ancient homeland.

PRINCIPAL OFFICE BUILDING FOR ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order for the Speaker to recognize the calling up for final passage today of H. R. 5645, to authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to construct a modern office building in or near the District of Columbia to serve as its principal office, notwithstanding that under unanimous-consent request further proceedings on this bill were postponed until Thursday for final passage.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it is now agreeable to those who opposed it temporarily.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I make the observation that the agricultural bill with reference to parity will not come up this week?

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Atomic Energy Commission is authorized, with funds presently available or otherwise made available to it, to acquire (by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, under the applicable provisions chapters 14 and 15 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954) a suitable site in or near the District of Columbia and, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to provide for the construction on such site, in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by or under the direction of the Commission, of a modern office building

(including necessary related equipment, and auxiliary structures, as well as vaults for the protection of restricted data) to serve as the principal office of the Commission at a total cost of not to exceed \$10 million and for that purpose there is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1722) to authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to construct a modern office building in or near the District of Columbia to serve as its principal office.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Atomic Energy Commission is authorized, with funds presently available or otherwise made available to it, to acquire (by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, under the applicable provisions of chapters 14 and 15 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954) a suitable site in or near the District of Columbia and, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to provide for the construction on such site, in accordance with plans and specifications prepared by or under the direction of the Commission, of a modern office building (including necessary related equipment, and auxiliary structures, as well as vaults for the protection of restricted data) to serve as the principal office of the Commission at a total cost of not to exceed \$10 million and for that purpose there is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

By unanimous consent, the proceedings whereby the bill H. R. 5645 was passed were vacated, and the bill was laid on the table.

PUBLIC DEVELOPMENT OF NIAGARA POWER

(Mr. DAVIDSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing in the House a bill identical with that introduced in the Senate by the great Senator from New York, HERBERT H. LEHMAN, to provide for the public development by the State of New York of electric power at Niagara Falls. The financing of the project will be borne by revenue bonds issued by New York State. Thus, there will be no cost to the Federal Government.

The great benefits which will inure to the public by the early completion of this project are patent. I am sure, therefore, that my colleague from New York [Mr. BUCKLEY] the chairman of our Public Works Committee, whose interest in this field is no less than mine, will shortly schedule hearings on this subject.

I include here a short but detailed analysis of the measure which Senator LEHMAN and I have introduced:

DETAILED ANALYSIS OF THE NIAGARA BILL

Section 1 takes cognizance of the Senate reservation to the Canadian-United States Treaty of 1950, and authorizes a public power project consistent therewith. The Senate reservation declares it the policy of the United States Government to make the Niagara project subject to congressional enactment for the public use and benefit.

Section 2 directs the Federal Power Commission to issue a license to the New York Power Authority for the construction and operation of the Niagara project, subject to the provisions of the Federal Power Act and to certain other licensing conditions as follows:

1. First preference in access to the project power to be given to counties and municipalities and their instrumentalities; to agencies of the New York State government; to rural electrification co-ops; and to United States defense agencies. Withdrawal clauses to be included in all contracts with private utilities to insure continued availability of power to preference customers.

2. Transmission lines to be built, acquired, or contracted for, to permit the project power to be widely distributed to load centers, and to preference customers, and to neighboring States, by wheeling or other arrangements.

3. A reasonable share of the project power to be made available to neighboring States within economic transmission distance of the power site, with the Federal Power Commission acting as referee to settle any disputes that might arise with neighboring States; assurance to be secured from such neighboring States, that preference customers within their borders be given first preference in access to the State's share of the Niagara power.

4. Project power to be sold and distributed primarily for the benefit of rural and domestic consumers, at the lowest rates reasonably possible;

5. The New York Power Authority to fix resale rates to insure compliance with the above.

6. A park and scenic drive is to be built on the American side of the Niagara River, to be financed by the power project in such part as the Federal Power Commission may approve.

SEVENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE STATE OF ISRAEL

(Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, this is the seventh anniversary of the independence of the State of Israel. In paying a salute to that young and vigorous state it is nice to note that in the 7 years of its existence, it has taken into its country and integrated into its economy as her own citizens some 750,000 refugees from all parts of the world. In the 70 years prior to its coming into existence there have been some 270 new agricultural settlements established in that area of the world. In the last 7 years there have been 400 new agricultural settlements created in that small area. In the short time since 1951, its annual deficit in the balance of trade has been reduced by \$100 million. Its railroad mileage has been doubled, and its highway mileage has been increased 50 percent. With all of this tremendous progress toward peace, it is regrettable that there is still no peace in that area of the world. This day the State of Israel and its people extend their grateful thanks to this

Public Law 29 - 84th Congress
Chapter 31 - 1st Session
H. R. 4647

AN ACT

To amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended. 69 Stat. 45.
69 Stat. 46.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 353 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding to subsection (c) thereof, two new paragraphs reading as follows: Rice.
63 Stat. 1059.
7 USC 1353.

"(3) Each of the State acreage allotments for 1955 heretofore proclaimed by the Secretary shall be increased by 2 per centum or by such greater acreage as may be necessary to provide such State with an allotment equal to its 1950 allotment. In any State having county acreage allotments for 1955 (i) the increase in the State allotment shall be apportioned among counties in the State on the same basis as the State allotment was heretofore apportioned among the counties, but without regard to adjustments for trends in acreage, and (ii) the 1955 allotment for any county in which the 1950-1954 average planted plus diverted acreage of rice, adjusted for trends in acreage, exceeds the 1945-1949 average planted acreage of rice, similarly adjusted, by more than 2 per centum shall then be further increased by such additional acreage as may be necessary to provide such county with an allotment equal to its 1950 allotment. The increases in the county acreage allotments and the increases in the State allotments, where county allotments are not determined, shall be used to establish farm acreage allotments which are fair and reasonable in relation to the applicable allotment factors specified in subsection (b) of this section and to correct inequities and prevent hardships. State allotments.
Increase and apportionment.

"(4) The reserve acreage made available for 1955 in any State for apportionment to farms operated by persons who have not produced rice during the preceding five years or on which rice has not been planted in the preceding five years shall not be less than five hundred acres; and the additional acreage necessary to provide such minimum reserve acreages shall be in addition to the National and State acreage allotments. Reserve acreage.

Approved May 5, 1955.

